

**BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL**

**CM No. 121 of 2025 in/and**

**Appeal No. 906 of 2024**

**Date of Decision: May 01,2026**

Shine Buildcon Private Limited through Authorized Representative Sh. Vikas Shah son of Shri Chandra Mohan Singh Shah, H-334, Ground Floor, New Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi

Appellant.

Versus

Kapil Tandon son of Sh. Baldev Kumar Tandon, H. No. A-27, Vishnu Garden Behind Sheetla Temple, New Delhi-110018

Respondent

**CORAM:**

**Justice Rajan Gupta  
Dinesh Singh Chauhan**

**Chairman  
Member (Technical)**

Present: Mr. Akshat Mittal, Advocate for the appellant.  
Mr. Harshit Joon, Advocate for the respondent.

**ORDER:**

**RAJAN GUPTA, CHAIRMAN**

In the accompanying appeal, challenge has been made to order dated 20.09.2024, passed by the Authority<sup>1</sup>, operative part whereof reads as under:

***“H. Directions issued by the Authority:***

*27. Hence, the Authority hereby passes this order and issues the following directions under section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance with obligations cast upon the promoter*

---

<sup>1</sup> Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

*as per the functions entrusted to the Authority under section 34(f) of the Act of 2016:*

*I. The respondent is directed to pay interest to the complainant 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. 16.06.2019 till the date of offer of possession (15.10.2023) plus two months i.e. 15.12.2023, as per Section 18(1) of the Act of 2016 read with Rule 15 of the Rules, ibid. The arrears of interest accrued so far shall be paid to the complainant within 90 days from the date of this order as per rule 16(2) of the Rules ibid. Also, an amount of Rs.79,130/- already adjusted by the respondent towards compensation for delay in handing over possession shall be deducted/adjusted towards the delayed possession charges to be paid by the respondent in terms of proviso to Section 18(1) of the Act.*

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

*III. The respondent is directed to issue a revised statement of account after adjustment of delayed possession charges, and other reliefs as per above within a period of 30 days from the date of this order. The complainant is directed to pay outstanding dues if any remains, after adjustment of delay possession charges within a period of next 30 days.*

*IV. The respondent shall hand over the possession of the subject unit within two weeks of the payment, if any due, having been made by the complainant.*

*V. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainant which is not the part of the buyer's agreement.*

*28. Complaint stands disposed of.*

*29. File be consigned to Registry.”*

2. The appeal is accompanied with an application seeking waiver/exemption from the pre-deposit required to be made along with the appeal in view of proviso to Section 43(5) of the Act<sup>2</sup>.

3. As per report from the Registry, the appellant-promoter is required to deposit Rs.18,38,883/- and there is deficit of Rs.16,12,423/-.

4. The plea taken by the appellant-promoter is that as per the impugned order, the amount of delay possession charges comes to Rs.17,59,753/- and the outstanding dues directed to be paid by the respondent-allottee to the promoter comes to Rs.15,33,293/-, thus, the appellant-promoter is required to deposit Rs.2,26,460/- along with the appeal.

5. In view of law laid down in **M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. v. State of UP, 2022(1) RCR (Civil) 367**, it is not possible to entertain an appeal which is not accompanied by requisite pre-deposit. There is no provision for waiver or exemption of pre-deposit. Relevant paragraphs of the judgment are reproduced hereunder for ready reference:

*"122. It may straightaway be noticed that Section 43(5) of the Act envisages the filing of an appeal before the appellate tribunal against the order of an authority or the adjudicating officer by any person aggrieved and where the promoter intends to appeal against an order of authority or adjudicating officer against imposition of penalty, the promoter has to deposit at least 30 per cent of the penalty*

*amount or such higher amount as may be directed by the appellate tribunal. Where the appeal is against any other order which involves the return of the amount to the allottee, the promoter is under obligation to deposit with the appellate tribunal the total amount to be paid to the allottee, which includes interest and compensation imposed on him, if any, or with both, as the case may be, before the appeal is to be instituted."*

*123. The plea advanced by the learned counsel for the appellants is that substantive right of appeal against an order of authority/adjudicating officer cannot remain dependent on fulfilment of pre-deposit which is otherwise onerous on the builders alone and only the builders/promoters who are in appeal are required to make the pre-deposit to get the appeal entertained by the Appellate Tribunal is discriminatory amongst the stakeholders as defined under the provisions of the Act.*

*xxxx            xxxx*

*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."*

6. Thus, we find no substance in the application. The issue raised in the application will ultimately depend on the final outcome of the appeal. However, interest of the allottee has to be secured in view of judgment in **M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd's case (supra)**. For this reason, pre-deposit has to be made as calculated by the Registry. It also needs to be mentioned here that pre-deposit is kept in approved bank in fixed deposit and draws admissible rate of interest and is disbursed as per entitlement of the parties on final decision of the appeal. Thus, no prejudice is likely to be caused to either party.

7. In view of above, it is evident that there is no scope for hearing the appeal on merits, as the same is not maintainable due to lack of pre-deposit. The same is hereby dismissed with no order as to costs. However, the appellant-promoter would be at liberty to seek revival of the appeal in case it makes good the deficit pre-deposit within one month from today. The application is, thus, dismissed. Consequently, the appeal is also dismissed.

8. The amount of pre-deposit made by the appellant-promoter, along with interest accrued thereon, be remitted to the Authority for disbursement to the respondent-allottee subject to tax liability, if any, after expiry of one month.

9. Copy of this order be sent to the parties/their counsel and the Authority.

10. File be consigned to records.

Justice Rajan Gupta,  
Chairman,  
Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal

Dinesh Singh Chauhan  
Member (Technical)

May 01 ,2026  
mk