

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

Complaint no. :	1532 of 2024
Order reserved on:	18.04.2025
Order pronounced on:	23.07.2025

1. Mahesh Gupta (HUF)
2. Ramesh Chand Agarwal

**Address at:** House no. DC-911/3, Saroj Mata  
Ji Ashram Wali Gali, Adarsh Nagar, Sonipat,  
Haryana-131001

**Complainants****Versus**

M/s Ansal Housing & Construction Limited  
**Office:** Ansal Plaza, 2F-AHCL, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, Ansal  
Plaza Mall, Sector-1, Vaishali, Ghaziabad (UP)  
- 201010

**Respondent****CORAM:**

Shri Ashok Sangwan

**Member****APPEARANCE:**

Sh. Sunil Kumar

Sh. Amandeep Kadyan

Advocate for the complainants

Advocate for the respondent

**ORDER**

1. The present complaint has been filed by the complainants/allottees under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (in short, the Act) read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (in short, the Rules) for violation of section 11(4)(a) of the Act wherein it is *inter alia* prescribed that the promoter shall be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions under the 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. Unit and project related details**

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

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project	"Ansal Hub 83" in Sector 83, Manesar, Gurgaon.
2.	Unit no.	415 (Page no. 24 of complaint) Unit no. mentioned as 609 at customer ledger
3.	Unit admeasuring	417.28 sq. ft. (Page no. 24 of complaint)
4.	Date of allotment letter	26.11.2011 (page no. 24 of complaint)
5.	Possession clause	26. The Developer shall offer possession of the Unit anytime within a period of <b>36 months from the date of sanction of building plans or date of execution of allotment whichever is later</b> , subject to force majeure circumstances such as God, fire, earthquake, flood, civil commotion, war, riot, explosion, terrorist, acts, sabotage or general shortage of energy labour equipment.....
6.	Due date of delivery of possession	26.11.2014



		(Note: 36 months from date of allotment i.e., 26.11.2011 as the date of sanction of building plans are not known)
7.	Total sale consideration	Rs. 18,30,158/- (page 24 of complaint)
8.	Total amount paid by the complainant	Rs. 22,55,192/- (as per customer ledger at page no. 20 of complaint)
9.	Occupation certificate	Not obtained
10.	Offer of possession	Not Offered

**B. Facts of the complaint**

3. The complainants have made the following submissions in the complaint:
- I. That on dated 23.02.2011 complainant booked a commercial office by paying a sum of Rs 2,64,277/-. Further, on dated 26.11.2011 allotment was executed in favour of Mr. Mahesh Gupta (HUF) & Ramesh Chand Agarwal and between the respondent in relation with unit no. 415, type office, admeasuring 417.28 sq. ft. for a basic sale consideration of Rs. 18,30,158/-.
  - II. That later unit no. 609 admeasuring super area 433 sq. ft. for a total sale consideration of Rs. 22,55,192/- issued by the respondent vide account statement dated 27.02.2014 and the complainant has paid an amount of Rs. 22,55,192/- as and when demanded by the respondent.
  - III. That vide clause 26 of the allotment letter the respondent agrees and promise to handover physical offer of possession of said unit within 36 months from the date of sanction of building plans or date of execution



of allotment letter, whichever is Later. But till today there is no offer of possession given by the respondent even and many other charges which is extra not part of payment plan impose by the respondent.

- IV. That unit no. 415 was booked in year 2011 and allotment was issued in favour of unit no. 415 but later as per account statement unit no. 609 was shown as there was no intimation and no approval taken from the complainant for transfer of the booked unit in year 2011. At present the complainant is confused which unit he has 415 or 609.

**C. Relief sought by the complainants:**

4. The complainants in the present complaint have seeking the following relief(s).
- (i) Direct the respondent to pay delay possession interest since 26.11.2014 as allotment was executed on 21.11.2011.
  - (ii) Direct the respondent to offer the legal offer of possession of the unit.
  - (iii) Direct the respondent for registration of conveyance deed in favor of the complainant.
5. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondent/promoter about the contraventions as alleged to have been committed in relation to section 11(4) (a) of the act to plead guilty or not to plead guilty.

**D. Reply by the respondent.**

6. The respondent has contested the complaint on the following grounds.
- I. That the complainants had booked the shop no.609 in their own name in an upcoming project Ansal Boulevard, Sector 83, Gurugram of the answering respondent. Upon the satisfaction of the complainant regarding inspection of the site, title, location plans, etc. an agreement to sell dated 26.11.2011 was signed between the parties as per claim of the complainant.



- II. 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 2011. The regulations at the concerned time period would regulate the project and not a subsequent legislation i.e. RERA Act, 2016. The parliament would not make the operation of a statute retrospective in effect.
- III. That the complaint specifically admits to not paying necessary dues or the full payment as agreed upon under the builder buyer agreement. The complainant cannot be allowed to take advantage of his own wrong.
- IV. That the complainant has admittedly filed the complaint in the year 2024 and the cause of action accrue occurred before that and is bound by limitation 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.
- V. That clause 34 of the said agreement provides for Rs. 5/ sq foot 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.
- VI. That the respondent had in due course of time obtained all necessary approvals from the concerned authorities. 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 respondent has in a timely and prompt manner ensured that the requisite compliances be obtained and cannot be faulted on giving delayed possession to the complainant.





- VII. That the delay has been occasioned on account of things beyond the control of the answering respondent. 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 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.
- VIII. That the complainant had signed and agreed on builder buyer agreement dated 06.01.2015. 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.
- IX. That the perusal of the builder buyer agreement at page 3 would show that 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."
- X. 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.

XI. That in an arbitral proceedings 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.

7. 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.

**E. Jurisdiction of the authority**

8. The authority has complete territorial and subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint for the reasons given below.

**E.I Territorial jurisdiction**

9. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town and Country Planning Department, Haryana the jurisdiction of Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram district for all purposes. 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**

10. 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.

11. So, in view of the provisions of the Act quoted above, the authority has complete jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the promoter leaving aside compensation which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer if pursued by the complainants at a later stage.

**F. Findings on the objections raised by respondent:**

**F.I Objection regarding jurisdiction of the complaint w.r.t the builder buyer agreement executed prior to coming into force of the Act.**

12. The respondent submitted that the complaint is neither maintainable nor tenable and is liable to be outrightly dismissed as the builder buyer's agreement was executed between the parties prior to the enactment of the Act and the provision of the said Act cannot be applied retrospectively.
13. The authority is of the view that the provisions of the Act are quasi retroactive to some extent in operation and would be applicable to the agreements for sale entered into even prior to coming into operation of the Act where the transaction are still in the process of completion. The Act nowhere provides, nor can be so construed, that all previous agreements would be re-written after coming into force of the Act. Therefore, the provisions of the Act, rules and agreement have to be





read and interpreted harmoniously. However, if the Act has provided for dealing with certain specific provisions/situation in a specific/particular manner, then that situation will be dealt with in accordance with the Act and the rules after the date of coming into force of the Act and the rules. Numerous provisions of the Act save the provisions of the agreements made between the buyers and sellers. The said contention has been upheld in the landmark judgment of **Neelkamal Realtors Suburban Pvt. Ltd. Vs. UOI and others. (W.P 2737 of 2017)** decided on 06.12.2017 and which provides as under:

- "119. Under the provisions of Section 18, the delay in handing over the possession would be counted from the date mentioned in the agreement for sale entered into by the promoter and the allottee prior to its registration under RERA. Under the provisions of RERA, the promoter is given a facility to revise the date of completion of project and declare the same under Section 4. The RERA does not contemplate rewriting of contract between the flat purchaser and the promoter..."
122. We have already discussed that above stated provisions of the RERA are not retrospective in nature. They may to some extent be having a retroactive or quasi retroactive effect but then on that ground the validity of the provisions of RERA cannot be challenged. The Parliament is competent enough to legislate law having retrospective or retroactive effect. A law can be even framed to affect subsisting / existing contractual rights between the parties in the larger public interest. We do not have any doubt in our mind that the RERA has been framed in the larger public interest after a thorough study and discussion made at the highest level by the Standing Committee and Select Committee, which submitted its detailed reports."

14. Also, in appeal no. 173 of 2019 titled as **Magic Eye Developer Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Ishwer Singh Dahiya**, in order dated 17.12.2019 the Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal has observed-

- "34. Thus, keeping in view our aforesaid discussion, we are of the considered opinion that the provisions of the Act are quasi retroactive to some extent in operation and will be applicable to the agreements for sale entered into even prior to coming into operation of the Act where the transaction are still in the process of completion. Hence in case of delay in the offer/delivery of possession as per the terms and conditions of the agreement for sale the allottee shall be



*entitled to the interest/delayed possession charges on the reasonable rate of interest as provided in Rule 15 of the rules and one sided, unfair and unreasonable rate of compensation mentioned in the agreement for sale is liable to be ignored."*

15. The agreements are sacrosanct save and except for the provisions which have been abrogated by the Act itself. Further, it is noted that the builder-buyer agreements have been executed in the manner that there is no scope left to the allottee to negotiate any of the clauses contained therein. Therefore, the authority is of the view that the charges payable under various heads shall be payable as per the agreed terms and conditions of the agreement subject to the condition that the same are in accordance with the plans/permissions approved by the respective departments/competent authorities and are not in contravention of any other Act, rules and regulations made thereunder and are not unreasonable or exorbitant in nature. Hence, in the light of above-mentioned reasons, the contention of the respondent w.r.t. jurisdiction stands rejected.

**F.II Objection regarding force majeure conditions:**

16. The respondent-promoter raised a contention that the construction of the project was delayed due to force majeure conditions such as various orders passed by 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, lockdown due to outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic which further led to shortage of labour and demonetization. Further, the authority has gone through the possession clause and observed that the respondent-developer proposes to handover the possession of the allotted unit within a period of 36 months from the date of sanction of building plans or date of execution of allotment letter, whichever is later. In the present case, the date of sanction of building plans are not



available so, the due date is calculated from the date of execution of allotment letter is 26.11.2011 therefore, the due date of subject unit comes out to be 26.11.2014. The events such as various orders by Punjab and Haryana High Court and demonetization were for a shorter duration of time and were not continuous as there is a delay of more than ten years. Even today no occupation certificate has been received by the respondent. Therefore, said plea of the respondent is null and void. As far as delay in construction due to outbreak of Covid-19 is concerned, the lockdown came into effect on 23.03.2020 whereas the due date of handing over of possession was much prior to the event of outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, the authority is of the view that outbreak of a pandemic cannot be used as an excuse for non-performance of a contract for which the deadlines were much before the outbreak itself and for the said reason, the said time period is not excluded while calculating the delay in handing over possession.

**F.III Objection regarding non impleadment of necessary party i.e., M/s Samyak Project Pvt. Ltd.**

17. The respondent in the present has pleaded that M/s Samyak Project Pvt. Ltd. should be impleaded as a necessary party to the case and should be held liable. The Authority observes that in the present complaint, it is evident that Ansal Housing Limited executed the agreement with the complainant and received consideration towards the same, for which receipts have been issued. Moreover, the M/s Samyak Project Pvt. Ltd. was not confirming party in the agreement executed between the complainant and the respondent. In view thereof, Ansal Housing Limited is held liable.

**G. Entitlement of the Complainants:**

- (i) Direct the respondent to pay delay possession interest since 26.11.2014 as allotment was executed on 21.11.2011.
  - (ii) Direct the respondent to offer the legal offer of possession of the unit.
18. The complainants intends to continue with the project and are 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."*

19. Clause 26 of the allotment letter provides the time period of handing over possession and the same is reproduced below:

**"27:**

***"The Developer shall offer possession of the Unit anytime within a period of 36 months from the date of sanction of building plans or date of execution of allotment whichever is later, subject to force majeure circumstances such as God, fire, earthquake, flood, civil commotion, war, riot, explosion, terrorist, acts, sabotage or general shortage of energy labour equipment....."***

20. **Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** The complainants are seeking delay possession charges in terms of proviso to section 18 of the Act which 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.

21. 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.
22. 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., 18.07.2025 is 9.10%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 11.10% per annum.
23. The definition of term 'interest' as defined under section 2(z) 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:

*"(z) "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;"*

24. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainants shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 11.10% p.a. by the respondent/promoter which is the same as is being granted to the complainants in case of delay possession charges.
25. On consideration of the documents available on record and submissions made by 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 allotment letter executed between the parties. It is a matter of fact that allotment letter containing terms and conditions regarding the said unit was executed between the parties on 26.11.2011. As per the clause 26 of the allotment letter dated 26.11.2011, the possession of the booked unit was to be delivered within a period of 36 months from the date of sanction of building plans or date of execution of allotment letter, whichever is later. In the present case, the date of sanction of building plans are not available so, the due date is calculated from the date of execution of allotment letter is 26.11.2011 therefore, the due date of subject unit comes out to be 26.11.2014. Furthermore, the respondent's request for a grace period based on force majeure is hereby denied, as the reasons for such denial have been outlined above. Till date no occupation certificate has been obtained by the respondent. The authority is of the considered view that there is delay on the part of the respondent to offer physical possession of the subject unit and it is failure on part of the promoter to fulfil its obligations and to hand over the possession within the stipulated period.



26. Accordingly, 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 complainants are entitled to delay possession charges at the prescribed rate of interest i.e., 11.10% p.a. for every month of delay on the amount paid by complainants to the respondent from the due date of possession i.e., 26.11.2014 till the offer of possession of the subject unit after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority plus two months or handing over of possession whichever is earlier as per the provisions of section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules.
27. The respondent is also directed to handover possession of the subject unit allotted to the complainants within a period of 60 days after obtaining valid occupation certificate.

**(iii) Direct the respondent for registration of conveyance deed in favor of the complainant.**

28. Section 17 (1) of the Act deals with duty of promoter to get the conveyance deed executed and the same is reproduced below:

***"17. Transfer of title.-***

*(1). The promoter shall execute a registered conveyance deed in favour of the allottee along with the undivided proportionate title in the common areas to the association of the allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be, and hand over the physical possession of the plot, apartment of building, as the case may be, to the allottees and the common areas to the association of the allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be, in a real estate project, and the other title documents pertaining thereto within specified period as per sanctioned plans as provided under the local laws:*

*i. Provided that, in the absence of any local law, conveyance deed in favour of the allottee or the association of the allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be, under this section shall be carried out by the promoter within three months from date of issue of occupancy certificate."*



29. Accordingly, the authority directs the respondent to execute the conveyance deed within 60 days in favour of the complainants after obtaining valid occupation certificate from the competent authority.

**H. Directions of the authority**

30. 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 respondent is directed to pay the interest at the prescribed rate i.e. 11.10% per annum for every month of delay on the amount paid by the complainants from the due date of possession i.e., 26.11.2014 till valid offer of possession of the subject unit after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority plus two months or handing over of possession whichever is earlier as per the provisions of section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules.
  - ii. The respondent is directed to pay arrears of interest accrued within 90 days from the date of this order as per rule 16(2) of the rules and thereafter monthly payment of interest be paid till date of handing over of possession shall be paid on or before the 10<sup>th</sup> of each succeeding month.
  - iii. The respondent is directed to handover possession of the unit allotted to the complainants within a period of 60 days after completing the unit in terms of buyer's agreement and obtaining of occupation certificate and execute conveyance deed on payment of stamp duty charges by the allottee in terms of Section 17 of the Act.
  - iv. The rate of interest chargeable from the allottees by the promoter, in case of default shall be 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 to the allottee, in case of default i.e., the delayed possession charges as per section 2(za) of the Act.

- v. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainants, which is not the part of the buyer's agreement.
31. Complaint as well as applications, if any, stands disposed off accordingly.
32. File be consigned to registry.

(Ashok Sangwan)  
Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 23.07.2025



**HARERA**  
**GURUGRAM**