BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, GURUGRAM

Date of decision:	13.05.2025

NAME OF THE BUILDER		ANSAL HOUSING LIMITED SAMYAK PROJECTS PVT. LTD.	
PROJECT NAME		ANSAL HUB 83 BOULEVARD	
S. No.	Case No.	Case title	APPEARANCE
1.	CR/2603/2023	Phool Kumar V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2)	Sh. Ajay Chahal Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1 Sh. Shanker Wig for R2
2.	CR/2758/2023	Seema Roy & Rajib Mandal V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2)	Sh. Ajay Chahal Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1 Sh. Shanker Wig for R2
3.	CR/3450/2023	Sanjay Upadhyay & Manju Upadhyay V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2)	Sh. Himanshu Gautam Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1 Sh. Shanker Wig for R2
4.	CR/3460/2023	Poonam Verma V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2)	Sh. Himanshu Gautam Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1 Sh. Shanker Wig for R2
5.	CR/3526/2023	Jagdish Chauhan HUF & Jagdish Chauhan V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2)	Sh. Himanshu Gautam Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1 Sh. Shanker Wig for R2
6.	CR/3527/2023	Sangeeta Chauhan & Jagdish Chauhan V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2)	Sh. Himanshu Gautam Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1 Sh. Shanker Wig for R2
7.	CR/3696/2023	Rajneesh Kumar V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and	Sh. Sahil Bhardwaj Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1

		Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2)	Sh. Shanker Wig for R2
8.	CR/3771/2023	Archay Tehlan V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2)	Sh. Sahil Bhardwaj Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1 Sh. Shanker Wig for R2
9.	CR/5021/2023	Vipan Kumar Jain & Vikas Jain V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2)	Sh. Shahank Mishra Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1 Sh. Shanker Wig for R2
10.	CR/6570/2022	Dinesh Kaniyam Parambil Jain V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2) (impleaded vide application dated 25.01.2024)	Sh. Khush Kakra Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1 Sh. Shanker Wig for R2
11.	CR/6572/2022	Dilip Dev Jayadevan & Kapil Dev Jayadevan V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2) (impleaded vide application dated 25.01.2024)	Sh. Khush Kakra Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1 Sh. Shanker Wig for R2
12.	CR/6573/2022	Dilip Dev Jayadevan & Kapil Dev Jayadevan V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. (R1)(*Formerly known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.*) and Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (R2) (impleaded vide application dated 25.01.2024)	Sh. Khush Kakra Sh. Amandeep Kadyan for R1 Sh. Shanker Wig for R2

CORAM:

Shri. Arun Kumar — **Chairperson**

Shri. Vijay Kumar Goyal — **Member**

Shri Ashok Sangwan — **Member**

ORDER

1. This order shall dispose of all the 12 complaints titled as above filed before this authority in form CRA under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and

Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred as "the Act") read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (hereinafter referred as "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 its obligations, responsibilities and functions to the allottees as per the agreement for sale executed inter se between parties.

2. The core issues emanating from them are similar in nature and the complainant(s) in the above referred matters are allottees of the project, namely, "Ansal Hub 83 Boulevard" (group housing colony) being developed by the same respondent/promoter i.e., M/s Ansal Housing Limited. The terms and conditions of the buyer's agreements, fulcrum of the issue involved in all these cases pertains to failure on the part of the promoter to deliver timely possession of the units in question, seeking award of delay possession charges along with intertest.

3. The details of the complaints, reply to status, unit no., date of agreement, possession clause, due date of possession, total sale consideration, total paid amount, and relief sought are given in the table below:

Project Name and Location	**"ANSAL HUB 83 BOULEVARD " Sector-83, Gurugram.**
Possession Clause: *"Clause 30* *The Developer shall offer of the unit any time a period of 42 months from the date of execution of agreement or within 42 months from the date of obtaining all the required sanctions and approval necessary for commencement of construction, whichever is later. Further there shall be a grace period 6 months allowed to the developer over and above the period of 42 months."* **(Emphasis supplied)**	
Occupation certificate: - Not obtained	
Offer of possession: Not offered	

CR No.	Unit	BBA	Due date	Sale consideration	Amount paid
CR/2603/2023	S-048	05.12.2014	05.12.2018	₹ 31,90,005/-	₹3,50,000/-
CR/2758/2023	S-002	20.01.2015	20.01.2019	₹22,62,265/-	₹17,73,198/-
CR/3450/2023	S-095	14.01.2015	14.01.2019	₹26,86,919/-	₹22,26,639/-
CR/3460/2023	G-076	30.12.2014	30.12.2018	₹47,67,851/-	₹37,63,205/-
CR/3526/2023	G-029	05.12.2014	05.12.2018	₹1,17,39,705/-	₹62,97,979/- Updated vide app dt. 31.01.2024
CR/3527/2023	G-028	06.01.2015 transfer on 21.05.2015	06.01.2019	₹1,14,43,545/-	₹55,48,128/- Updated vide app dt. 23.02.2024
CR/3696/2023	S-027	05.12.2014	05.12.2018	₹22,42,876/-	₹21,23,224/-
CR/3771/2023	S-026	03.01.2015	03.01.2019	₹27,01,747/-	₹24,47,944/-
CR/5021/2023	G-043	18.12.2014	18.12.2018	₹1,18,91,298/-	₹1,27,87,217/-
CR/6570/2022	G-072	03.01.2015	03.01.2019	₹71,19,845/-	₹74,09,602/-
CR/6572/2022	F-030	17.12.2014	17.12.2018	₹51,08,892/-	₹40,37,375/-
CR/6573/2022	G-070	17.12.2014	17.12.2018	₹74,37,202/-	₹77,07,611/-

4. The aforesaid complaints were filed by the complainants against the promoter on account of violation of the builder buyer's agreement executed between the parties in respect of said unit for not handing over the possession by the due date, seeking award of delay possession charges along with interest. The relief sought by the complainants in the said complaints are as under:

CR No.	Relief sought
CR/2603/2023	Possession and DPC
CR/2758/2023	Possession and DPC
CR/3450/2023 CR/3460/2023 CR/3526/2023	DPC

	Refrain the respondent no. 2 from implementing contents of letter dated 04.05.2023 (for executing MoU with respondent no. 2 for KYC purpose) Direct the respondents to complete the construction of the project and hand over the possession of the allotted unit. Direct the respondents to commit a date of offering the possession of the allotted unit. Litigation cost
CR/3527/2023	DPC Restrain the respondent from implementing the contents of letter dated 04.05.2023 and taking any adverse action against the complainant. *On 20.08.2024 the Authority already restrained the respondents from creating any third-party rights against the complainant. Commit a date for offering the possession. Complete the project. Litigation cost ₹1,00,000/-
CR/3696/2023 CR/3771/2023	DPC Direct the respondent to provide certified copies of the relevant court orders in respect of pending between respondents qua. Certify the name of the respondent entitled to demand and collect any future payment from the complainant qua the said unit and to handover the physical possession of the unit and further execute the title documents in favour of complainant
CR/5021/2023	Possession DPC litigation cost
CR/6570/2022 CR/6572/2022 CR/6573/2022	The present complaint was filed for DPC, Possession and litigation cost whereas, the counsel for complainant on 28.05.2024 during the course of hearing requested for refund of the paid-up amount along with interest. The Authority directed the complainant to file the clarification regarding relief to be filed in the registry. Till date no such clarification is file by the complainant accordingly, the Authority is proceeding with the relief of DPC & Possession only.
CR/6573/2022	Possession DPC Refund ₹3 lacs towards parking Litigation cost
Abbreviations used: DPC: Delay Possession charges	

5. It has been decided to treat the said complaints as an application for non-compliance of statutory obligations on the part of the promoter/ respondent in

terms of section 34(f) of the Act which mandates the authority to ensure compliance of the obligations cast upon the promoters, the allottee(s) and the real estate agents under the Act, the rules and the regulations made thereunder.

6. The facts of all the complaints filed by the complainant(s)/allottee(s)are also similar. Out of the above-mentioned case, the particulars of lead case ***CR/2758/2023 Seema Roy V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. and anr.*** are being taken into consideration for determining the rights of the allottee(s) qua delay possession charges along with interest and compensation.

A. Project and unit related details

7. The particulars of the project, the details of sale consideration, the amount paid by the complainant(s), date of proposed handing over the possession, delay period, if any, have been detailed in the following tabular form:

CR/2758/2023 Seema Roy V/s Ansal Housing Ltd. And anr.

S. No.	Particulars	Details
1.	Project name and location	Ansals Hub 83 Boulevard, Sector 83 Gurugram
2.	Project area	2.60acres
3.	Nature of project	Commercial Project
4.	RERA registered/not registered	Registered 09/2018 Dated 08.01.2018
5.	DTPC license no. & validity status	License No. 71 of 2010 dated 15.09.2010
6.	Date of execution of buyer agreement	20.01.2015 (R2 is the confirming party) (page no 14 of complaint)
7.	Unit No.	S-002 (Page no. 18 of complaint)

8.	Unit area admeasuring	330 sq. ft. (Page no 18 of complaint)
9.	Possession clause	***Clause 30 of BBA*** *The Developer shall offer of the unit any time a period of 42 months from the date of execution of agreement or within 42 months from the date of obtaining all the required sanctions and approval necessary for commencement of construction, whichever is later, further there shall be a grace period 6 months allowed to the developer over and above the period of 42 months.*
10.	Due date of Possession	20.01.2019 (Calculated from the date of Execution of Agreement as the date of commencement of construction is not placed on record) (grace period of 6 months allowed being unqualified)
11.	Sale consideration	₹22,62,265/- (pg. no 18 of complaint)
12.	Total amount paid by the complainant	₹17,73,198/- (as alleged by the complainant at pg. 8 of complaint)
13.	Offer of Possession	NA
14.	Occupation Certificate	NA

B. Facts of the complaint

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

a. That the complainant is a law-abiding Indian Citizen and the Respondents are private limited company incorporated under The Companies Act, 1956 registered with the Office of Registrar of Companies, Delhi and the companies are engaged in the business activities relating to construction,

development, marketing & sales of various types of residential as well as commercial properties to its various customers/clients and works for gains.

b. That after visiting various places in Gurugram in search of a good commercial shop, the complainant came into contact with the respondent's company officials by the sales/marketing agent of the respondent, where it was informed to the complainant that the respondent's company is s developing a commercial project "ANSAL HUB 83 BOULEVARD" situated at Sector-83, Gurugram in 2.60 Acre land. On going through the attractive Brochure, the payment plan and assurance given by the officials of the respondent's company regarding constructing of various projects in Gurgaon and other Districts of Haryana within the stipulated period. It was intimated that project is in pre-launching stage and it would be huge benefits to the complainant as after launching of the project, the rates of the properties would soar to the great high's and by the reputation of the respondent's company, the complainant decided to have a shop in the respondent's company project.

c. That complainant duly believed the statement of the representative of respondent and applied for the allotment of a Shop bearing No S-002 having the super area of 330.00 Sq. ft. in the said project the consideration amount was Rs.6995/- per sq. ft. Disclosed by the respondent company as per the Builder Buyer Agreement excluding of EDC, IDC, IFMS, Electrical Connection, Sewage Connection and water connection and other charges. The complainant has paid the booking amount and the respondent company allotted the Shop/Unit No.S-002 and issued an allotment letter dated 05.08.2014.

d. That the Builder Buyer Agreement was executed between the complainant and the respondent company on 20.01.2015 at Gurugram. That apart from issuing a payment receipts on different dates, acknowledging the receipt of amount, the respondent company also issued an allotment letter Dated 05.08.2014 carrying the details of unit allotted and also the details of amount to be deposited by the complainant's time to time as per payment plan opted by the complainants as per Annexure.

e. That as per one of the terms and conditions of the said Builder Buyer Agreement executed on 20.01.2015, it was agreed upon and settled down between the complainant and the respondent company that the possession of the said Unit/Shop shall be handed over to the complainant within the period of 42 months from the date of execution of the Agreement. That according to the Clause No. 30 of Builder Buyer Agreement dated 20.01.2015, the respondent company was duty bound to handover the physical possession of the above said Unit/Shop to the complainant positively up to 05.02.2018 but till date nothing has been done in that context.

f. That the complainant without making any kind of delay always deposited the amount required as per the payment plan/schedule opted by the complainants immediately on receipt of letters from the respondent company and in total the complainant had paid an amount of Rs.17,73,198/-. That from the above said timely payments made by the complainant in the respondent company leaves no iota of doubt that the complainant has been very sincere and honest while complying with the terms and conditions of the letter of allotment dated 05.08.2014 as well as of Builder Buyer Agreement dated 20.01.2015 as the same was agreed and

settled to be payable at the time of offer of peaceful physical possession complete in all respect of the said Unit by the respondent company.

g. That on account of not constructing the above said Unit within a stipulated period of 42 months, the complainant contacted the respondents several times to inquire after the progress of construction of the booked unit and asked to handover the peaceful physical possession of the above said unit on committed period to the complainant but to no purpose at all. All the times the respondents kept on misguiding and putting forth before the complainant one reason or the other and could not adhere to the terms and conditions as settled down and agreed upon between the respondent and the complainant in Builder Buyer Agreement dated 20.01.2015. And that so much so, the respondents failed to handed over the physical possession of the above said unit to the complainants till date.

h. That instead of admitting their fault/negligence on account of not offering the possession of the said Unit to the complainant fit for living, respondents kept on issuing reminders for illegal demand of payment regularly. That the respondents had crossed all the limits by keeping aside all the provisions of law of the land and without bothering having any fear of natural justice of law, they kept on sending their illegal demands to the complainant regularly.

i. That on account of issuance of the above illegal demands regularly, followed by reminders and claiming huge amount without their being any justification leaves no doubt in the minds of the complainant that the respondents being such a type of company which firstly trapped the several innocent home buyers customers like the complainant by showing attractive brochures, boosting about the reputation of the respondents and once the customers like the complainant are trapped in their net, the

builder company without having any justification and fear of law of the land continuously carried on its illegal demands of amount without having any norms leaving the customers. That like the complainant several other buyers are compelled to run from pillar to post without their being any fault on their part.

j. That on account of being not getting the possession of the above said Unit allotted to the complainant within the stipulated period of 42 months, the complainant had suffered a huge monetary loss for the past more than 5 years. That, the complainant approached the respondents many a times to inquire after the progress made in the construction of the said unit and handing over the physical possession of the said unit/shop. But the respondents did not even bother to respond the buyer and paid no heed to his request.

k. That, till date the respondents had failed to complete the said project on the assured time and date. That the Respondents had backed out from their assurances / promises and kept on misappropriating the huge hard-earned money of the complainant.

l. That as the Respondents have failed to discharge their liabilities to complete the project and to handover the peaceful physical possession of the allotted unit / shop to the complainant within the stipulated time and thus the respondents have cheated the complainant to invest his hard-earned money on believing upon their false assurances. The Respondents in a master minded and scripted way succeeded to their ulterior motive and caused wrongful losses to the complainant for their wrongful gains. Thus the Respondents have not only breached the trust of the complainant but also in a planned and thoughtful way cheated/defrauded the complainant. The complainant due to their said illegal acts, conduct and

misdeeds of the respondent company had suffered a great loss of money. The Respondents are involved in the swindling and embezzlement of funds not only of the complainant, but several other peoples at large. Therefore, the respondent company is liable to pay the delay possession compensation to the complainant with compound interest @ 24 % per annum till the respondent company handover the physical possession to the complainant immediately.

C. Relief sought by the complainant:

9. The complainant has sought following relief(s)

   a. Direct the respondent to handover the physical possession of the unit along with the delayed possession charges along with interest @ 24% per annum to the complainant.

10. 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 no. 1.

11. The respondent has contested the complaint on the following grounds:

   a. That the complainants had approached the answering Respondent for booking a shop no. S-002 in an upcoming project Ansal Boulevard, Sector 83, Gurugram. Upon the satisfaction of the complainant regarding inspection of the site, title, location plans, etc. an agreement to sell dated 20.01.2015 was signed between the parties.

   b. That the current dispute cannot be governed by the RERA Act, 2016 because of the fact that the builder buyer agreement signed between the complainant and the answering Respondent was in the year 2015. It is submitted that the regulations at the concerned time period would regulate the project and not a subsequent legislation i.e. RERA Act, 2016. It

is further submitted that Parliament would not make the operation of a statute retrospective in effect.

c. That the complaint specifically admits to not paying necessary dues or the full payment as agreed upon under the builder buyer agreement. It is submitted that the complainant cannot be allowed to take advantage of his own wrong. That even if for the sake of argument, the averments and the pleadings in the complaint are taken to be true, the said complaint has been preferred by the complainant belatedly. The complainant has admittedly filed the complaint in the year 2023 and the cause of action accrue on 20.01.2019 as per the complaint itself. Therefore, it is submitted that the complaint cannot be filed before the HRERA Gurugram as the same is barred by limitation.

d. That even if the complaint is admitted to be true and correct, the agreement which was signed in the year 2015 without coercion or any duress cannot be called in question today. It is submitted that the builder buyer agreement provides for a penalty in the event of a delay in giving possession. It is submitted that clause 34 of the said agreement provides for Rs. 5/ sq. ft. per month on super area for any delay in offering possession of the unit as mentioned in Clause 30 of the agreement. Therefore, the complainant will be entitled to invoke the said clause and is barred from approaching the Hon'ble Commission in order to alter the penalty clause by virtue of this complaint more than 8 years after it was agreed upon by both parties.

e. That the Respondent had in due course of time obtained all necessary approvals from the concerned authorities. It is submitted that the permit for environmental clearances for proposed group housing project for Sector 103, Gurugram, Haryana on 20.02.2015. Similarly, the approval for

digging foundation and basement was obtained and sanctions from the department of mines and geology were obtained in 2012. Thus, the Respondents have in a timely and prompt manner ensured that the requisite compliances be obtained and cannot be faulted on giving delayed possession to the Complainant.

f. That the answering Respondent has adequately explained the delay. It is submitted that the delay has been occasioned on account of things beyond the control of the answering Respondent. It is further submitted that the builder buyer agreement provides for such eventualities and the cause for delay is completely covered in the said clause. The Respondent ought to have complied with the orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh in CWP No. 20032 of 2008, dated 16.07.2012, 31.07.2012, 21.08.2012. The said orders banned the extraction of water which is the backbone of the construction process. Similarly, the complaint itself reveals that the correspondence from the Answering Respondent specifies force majeure, demonetization and the orders of the Hon'ble NGT prohibiting construction in and around Delhi and the COVID -19 pandemic among others as the causes which contributed to the stalling of the project at crucial junctures for considerable spells.

g. That the answering respondent and the complainant admittedly have entered into a builder buyer agreement which provides for the event of delayed possession. It is submitted that clause 31 of the builder buyer agreement is clear that there is no compensation to be sought by the complainant/prospective owner in the event of delay in possession.

h. That the answering Respondent has clearly provided in clause 34 the consequences that follow from delayed possession. It is submitted that the Complainant cannot alter the terms of the contract by preferring a

complaint before the Hon'ble HRERA Gurugram. That admittedly, the Complainant had signed and agreed on Builder Buyer Agreement dated 20.01.2015. That perusal of the said agreement would show that it is a Tripartite Agreement wherein M/s Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. is also a party to the said agreement.

i. That the perusal of the builder buyer agreement at page 3 would show that the proposed party to be impleaded i.e., M/s Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. not only possesses all the rights and unfettered ownership of the said land whereupon the project namely Ansal Boulevard, Sector 83 is being developed, but also is a developer in the said project. That the operating lines at page 3 of the builder buyer agreement are as follow: "The developer has entered into an agreement with the confirming party 3 i.e., M/s Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. to jointly promote, develop and market the proposed project being developed on the land as aforesaid."

j. The said M/s Samyak Project Pvt. Ltd. in terms of its arrangement with the respondent could not develop the said project well within time as was agreed and given to the respondent, the delay, if any, is on the part of M/s Samyak Project Pvt. Ltd. not on the part of respondent, because the construction and development of the said project was undertaken by M/s Samyak Project Pvt. Ltd.

k. That in an arbitral proceeding before the Ld. Arbitrator Justice A.K Sikri, M/s Samyak Project Pvt. has taken over the present project the answering respondent for completion of the project and the respondent has no locus or say in the present project.

E. Reply by the respondent no. 2

12. The respondent has contested the complaint on the following grounds:

a. That the respondent no.2 i.e., Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. (Landowner) and respondent no.1 i.e., Ansal Housing Constructions Ltd. (Developer/ AHL) entered into a memorandum of understanding dated 12.04.2013 (hereinafter referred to as "MoU") in respect of construction and development of a project known as Ansal Boulevard 83 (hereinafter referred to as "said Project"), situated on a land admeasuring 2.60 acres (equivalent to 20 Kanal 16 Marlas), situated in Village Sihi, Tehsil & District Gurgaon in Sector 83 of Gurgaon, Manesar forming a part of License No. 113 of 2008 dated 01.06.2008 and License No. 71 of 2010 dated 15.09.2010. As per the said MoU, the respondent no.1 being the developer, made sales of various units to the allottee(s), executed builder buyer agreements) with allottee(s) and also received sale consideration amount from the allottee(s). The respondent no.2 was not a party to any builder buyer agreement executed between respondent no.1 and the complainant and for the same respondent no. 2 i.e. Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. have filed an application under Order 7 Rule 11 under CPC for rejection of plaint as a party in this complaint.

b. That the perusal of the builder buyer agreement at page 3 ("Clause D") would show that M/s Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. possesses all the rights and unfettered ownership of the said land whereupon the projects namely boulevard 83, Sector 83 Gurgaon, Haryana is being developed.

c. As Respondent No.1 failed to fulfil its obligation under the said MoU and construction of the said Project was substantially delayed. Therefore, due to abject failure of Respondent No.1 to perform its obligations under the said MoU and to construct the said Project, the Respondent No.2 being left with no other option, terminated the said MoU vide Termination Notice dated 10.11.2020.

d. The Respondent No.2 also published a Public Notice in the newspaper dated 16.12.2020 informing the public at large about the termination of said MoU by Respondent No.2 due to breach of the terms of MoU by the Respondent No. 1. As Respondent No.1 failed to fulfil its obligation under the said MoU and construction of the said Project was substantially delayed. Therefore, due to abject failure of Respondent No.1 to perform its obligations under the said MoU and to construct the said Project, the Respondent No.3 being left with no other option, terminated the said MoU vide Termination Notice dated 10.11.2020.

e. The Respondent No.1 challenged the termination of MoU before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in OMP (I) (COMM) No.431 of 2020 in the matter titled as "Ansal Housing Limited vs. Samyak Projects Private Limited" under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi was pleased to refer the matter to Arbitration and appointed Justice A.K Sikri, (Retired Judge of Supreme Court) as the Sole Arbitrator and appointed Local Commissioner.

f. The Learned Arbitrator rejected the prayer of Respondent No.1 for stay on the termination of MoU and directed the Respondent No.1 to handover the possession of said Project on 14.10.2021 to Respondent No.2 for taking over the balance construction of the said Project. The Learned Arbitrator vide Order dated 02.09.2022 held that Respondent No.2 shall also be free to approach the allottees and demand and/or collect monies from them in respect of their Units.

g. That the answering respondent acting in good faith and in the interest of public at large, in benefit/interest of the allottees of the aforementioned project, the answering respondent sought to authenticate and verify the veracity of the agreements/allotments made by AHL and urged the

allottees including the complainants vide various Emails to come forward for KYC process and show bona fide by paying the balance amounts payable due as the project stood on the verge of completion.

h. It came to the knowledge of Respondent No.2 that Respondent No. 1 has done several dummy transactions by creating fake profiles of allottees. Thus, the Respondent No.2 issued Notice dated 04.05.2023 to the Complainant for verification of the Complainant and legitimacy of the transaction undertaken by Respondent No.1.

i. Notice dated 04.05.2023 to the Complainants in order to comply with the verification process. It was specifically mentioned that, in case no response is received on or before 20.05.2023 from the allottees, then the allotment of the said Unit Bearing No. S-002 shall stand forfeited/cancelled. Despite numerous attempts to engage with the Addressees of the Complainants, no satisfactory response or compliance was received, leading to the cancellation of the allotment of said Unit Bearing No. S-002 in question.

j. Since Respondent No. 1 is registered as 'Promoter' in respect of the said Project with the Real Estate Regulatory Authority ("RERA"), Respondent No.2 requires a No Objection Certificate from the Allottees for the purpose of carrying forth the development of the said Project and obtain necessary permission from the RERA. Therefore, in order to change the Developer of said Project, the Respondent No.2 required written consent of the allottees of said Project. In this regard, Respondent No.2 issued Notice dated 14.06.2023 and 03.08.2023 requesting the Complainant to sign the Addendum Agreement with Respondent No.2 to accept and acknowledge Respondent No.2 as the new Developer.

k. That said Ansal Housing Ltd in terms of its BBA dated 20.01.2015 with the Complainant. It is pertinent to note that the delay in completion of the

Project is caused due to the malfeasance and negligence of the M/s Ansal Housing Ltd. Not on the part Respondent No.2, because the construction and development of the said project was undertaken by M/s Ansal Housing Ltd.

I. That after fully understanding that Respondent no. 2 as a land owner have their limited liabilities to the Extend provided the land only and as a confirming party and Sign Builder Buyer Agreement without having any obligation towards Completion and Construction and Financial liability in the project and Builder Buyer Agreement.

13. Copies of all the relevant documents have been filed and placed on record. Their authenticity is not in dispute. Hence, the complaint can be decided on the basis of these undisputed documents and submission made by the parties.

F. Jurisdiction of the authority

14. The authority observes that it has territorial as well as subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint for the reasons given below.

F. I Territorial jurisdiction

15. 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.

F. II Subject matter jurisdiction

16. 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.

17. 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.

G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainants.

G.I. Direct the respondent to handover the physical possession of the unit along with the delayed possession charges along with interest @ 24% per annum to the complainant.

18. In the present matter the complainant was allotted unit no. S-002, admeasuring 330 sq. ft. in the project "Ansal Hub 83 Boulevard" Sector 83 by the respondent-builder for a total sale consideration of ₹22,62,265/- and they have paid a sum of ₹17,73,198/-. A buyer's agreement dated 20.01.2015 was executed between the allottee and respondent no. 1 wherein respondent no. 2 was the confirming party. As per clause 30 of the BBA, respondent no. 1 was obligated to complete the construction of the project and hand over the possession of the subject unit within 42 months from the date of execution of agreement or within 42 months from the date of obtaining all the required sanctions and approval sanctions and approval necessary for commencement of construction, whichever is later. The

occupation certificate for the project has not yet been obtained from the competent authority.

19. As per the BBA, respondent no. 2(land owner) and respondent no. 1(developer) entered into a MoU dated 12.04.2013 whereby the development and marketing of the project was to be done by the respondent no. 1 in terms of the license/permissions granted by the DTCP, Haryana. Upon failure of respondent no. 1 to perform its obligations as per MoU and complete the construction of the project within the agreed timeline, respondent no. 2 terminated the said MoU vide notice dated 10.11.2020 and issued a public notice in newspaper for termination of the MoU. The matter pursuant to the dispute was referred to the Delhi High Court under section 9 of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996 and vide order dated 22.01.2021 Hon'ble High Court of Delhi appointed the Hon'ble Justice A.K. Sikri, former Judge of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India as a sole arbitrator of Arbitral Tribunal.

20. The complainant i.e., Ansal Housing Pvt. Ltd. in the petition sought various reliefs including to stay the operation of the termination letter dated 10.11.2020 and the public notice dated 16.12.2020 till the final arbitral award is given. The Arbitral Tribunal vide order dated 31.08.2021 granted no stay on termination notice dated 10.11.2020 and no restraining order in this regard was passed against the M/s Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. Further, vide order dated 13.10.2021 of the sole arbitrator respondent no. 1 was directed to handover the aforementioned project to the respondent no. 2. Following the directive outlined in the order dated 13.10.2021 of the sole arbitrator, respondent no. 1 handed over the project to respondent no. 2 via a possession letter dated 14.10.2021, for the purpose of undertaking the remaining construction tasks. Subsequently, on 02.09.2022, the Sole Arbitrator directed respondent no. 2 to finalize the project within the stipulated timeline, specifically by the conclusion

of June 2023 and to collect funds from the allottees with a condition that the amount so collected shall be put in escrow account.

21. The authority is of the view that the builder buyer agreement dated 20.01.2015 was signed by the complainants and the respondent no. 1. The respondent no. 2 is a confirming party to that BBA. In the builder buyer agreement dated 20.01.2015 it was specifically mentioned that respondent no. 2(land owner) and respondent no. 1(developer) entered into a MoU dated 12.04.2013 whereby the development and marketing of the project was to be done by the respondent no. 1 in terms of the license/permissions granted by the DTCP, Haryana. Although the respondent no.2 i.e., Samyak Projects Pvt. Ltd. cancelled the agreement vide termination notice dated 10.11.2020 and the matter is subjudice before the arbitral tribunal appointed by Delhi High Court vide order dated 22.01.2021. It is relevant to refer the definition of the term 'Promoter' under the section 2(zk)of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016.

> *2. Definitions.-*
> *(zk) "promoter" means*
> *(i) a person who constructs or causes to be constructed an independent building or a building consisting of apartmets, or converts an existing building or a part thereof into apartments, for the purpose of selling all or some of the apartments to other persons and includes his assignees; or*
> *(ii) a person who develops land into a project, whether or not the person also constructs structures on any of the plots, for the purpose of selling to other persons all or some of the plots in the said project, whether with or without structures thereon; or*
> *(iii) xxxxxxxx*

22. The authority observes that landowner is covered by the definition of promoter under sub clause (i) or (ii) of section 2(zk). A person who constructs or causes to be constructed a building or apartments is a promoter if such building or apartments are meant for the purpose of selling to other persons. Similarly, a person who develops land into a project i.e., land into plots is a promoter in

respect of the fact that whether or not the person also constructs structures on any of the plots. It is clear that a person develops land into plots or constructs building or apartment for the purpose of sale is a promoter. The words, "causes to be constructed" in definition of promoter is capable of covering the landowner, in respect of construction of apartments and buildings. There may be a situation where the landowner may not himself develops land into plots or constructs building or apartment himself, but he causes it to be constructed or developed through someone else. Hence, the landowner is expressly covered under the definition of promoter under Section 2 (zk) sub clause (i) and (ii).

23. Further, the authority observes that the occupation certificate for the project is yet to be received and the project stands transferred to the respondent no. 2 who is now responsible to complete the same. In view of the above, the liability under provisions of Section 18(1) of the Act & Rules read with builder buyer agreement shall be borne by both the respondents jointly and severally and the liability to handover the unit shall lie with respondent no. 2.

24. In view of the above, the liability under provisions of Section 18(1) of the Act & Rules read with builder buyer agreement shall be borne by the respondent. The complainant intends to continue with the project and are seeking delay possession charges interest on the amount paid. 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:

> *"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. -*
> *in accordance with the terms of the agreement for sale or, as the case may be, duly completed by the date specified therein; or*

due to discontinuance of his business as a developer on account of suspension or revocation of the registration under this Act or for any other reason,
he shall be liable on demand to the allottees, in case the allottee wishes to withdraw from the project, without prejudice to any other remedy available, to return the amount received by him in respect of that apartment, plot, building, as the case may be, with interest at such rate as may be prescribed in this behalf including compensation in the manner as provided under this Act:
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."

(Emphasis supplied)

25. Clause 30 of the BBA provides for handing over of possession and is reproduced below:

> ***"Clause 30***
> *The Developer shall offer possession of the unit within a time period of 42 months from the date of execution of Agreement or within 42 months from the date of obtaining all required sanctions and approval necessary for commencement of construction, whichever is later. Further, there shall be a grace period of 6 months allowed to the developer over and above the period of 42 months as above in offering the possession of the unit."*

26. **Due date of possession and admissibility of grace period:** As per clause 30 of the BBA, the possession of the allotted unit was supposed to be offered within a stipulated timeframe of within 42 months from the date of execution of Agreement or within 42 months from the date of obtaining all required sanctions and approval necessary for commencement of construction, whichever is later. The period of 42 months is calculated from the date of buyer's agreement i.e., 20.01.2015 as the date of commencement of construction is not known. As far as grace period of 6 months is concerned the same is allowed being unqualified. Accordingly, the due date of possession comes out to be 20.01.2019. The occupation certificate for the project has not yet been obtained from the competent authority.

27. **Payment of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** The complainants are seeking delay possession charges at the 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] 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.*

28. 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.

29. 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., 13.05.2025 is **9.10%**. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., **11.10%**.

30. 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—
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 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;"

31. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainants shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 11.10% by the respondent/promoter which is the same as is being granted to them in case of delayed possession charges.
32. On consideration of the documents available on record and submissions made by the parties regarding contravention as per provisions of the Act, 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 30 of the buyer's agreement, the possession of the subject unit was to be delivered within stipulated time i.e., by 20.01.2019. However, till date no occupation certificate has been received by respondents and neither possession has been handed over to the allottee till date.
33. The Authority is of considered view that there is delay on the part of the respondents to offer of possession of the allotted unit to the complainants as per the terms and conditions of the allotment letter. 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.
34. 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/promoter is established. As such, the allottee shall be paid by the promoter interest for every

month of delay from the due date of possession i.e., 20.01.2019 till the date of valid offer of possession plus 2 months after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority or actual handing over of possession, whichever is earlier at prescribed rate i.e., 11.10% p.a. as per proviso to section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules. The following table concludes the time period for which the complainants-allottees are entitled to delayed possession charges in terms of proviso to section 18(1) of the Act:

CR no.	Period for which the complainants are entitled to DPC
CR/2603/2023	W.e.f. 05.12.2018 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.
CR/2758/2023	W.e.f. 20.01.2019 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.
CR/3450/2023	W.e.f. 14.01.2019 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.
CR/3460/2023	W.e.f. 30.12.2018 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.
CR/3526/2023	W.e.f. 05.12.2018 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.
CR/3527/2023	W.e.f. 06.01.2019 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.
CR/3696/2023	W.e.f. 05.12.2018 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.

CR/3771/2023	W.e.f. 03.01.2019 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.
CR/5021/2023	W.e.f. 18.12.2018 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.
CR/6570/2022	W.e.f. 03.01.2019 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.
CR/6572/2022	W.e.f. 17.12.2018 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.
CR/6573/2022	W.e.f. 17.12.2018 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.

35. As per the interim order of the sole Arbitrator the said project has now been physically handed over to the respondent no. 2 and there is nothing on the record to show that the said respondent has applied for occupation certificate or what is the status of the completion of development of the above-mentioned project. In view of the above, the respondent no. 2 is directed to handover possession of the flat/unit to the complainant in terms of section 17 of the Act of 2016, within two months after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority.

G.III. Litigation cost.

36. The complainant is also seeking relief w.r.t. litigation cost. It is observed that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in civil appeal nos. 6745-6749 of 2021 titled as ***M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. V/s State of Up & Ors.*** 2021-2022(1) RCR(c),357 has held that an allottee is entitled to claim compensation under sections 12,14,18 and section 19 which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer as per section 71 and the quantum of compensation shall be adjudged by the adjudicating officer having due regard to the factors

mentioned in section 72. The adjudicating officer has exclusive jurisdiction to deal with the complaints in respect of compensation.

H. Directions of the authority:

37. 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):

a. The respondents/promoters jointly and severally are directed to pay interest at the prescribed rate of 11.10% p.a. for every month of delay from due date of possession till the date of valid offer of possession plus 2 months after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority or actual handing over of possession, whichever is earlier; at prescribed rate i.e., 11.10% p.a. as per proviso to section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules.

b. The respondent no. 2 is directed to hand over the actual physical possession of the unit to the complainants within 2 months after obtaining occupation certificate

c. 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 respondent/promoter 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.

d. The complainants are directed to pay outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment of interest for the delayed period.

e. The respondents are directed to pay arrears of interest accrued within 90 days from the date of order of this order as per rule 16(2) of the rules.

f. The respondent shall not charge anything which is not the part of BBA.

38. This decision shall mutatis mutandis apply to cases mentioned in para 3 of this order.

39. The complaints stand disposed of.

40. Files be consigned to registry.

(Ashok Sangwan)
Member

(Vijay Kumar Goyal)
Member

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

Dated: 13.05.2025