

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

Date of order: 30.01.2026

NAME OF THE BUILDER		M/s Neo Developers Private Limited.	
PROJECT NAME		Neo Square	
S. No.	Case No.	Case title	Appearance
1.	CR/2582/2025	Amita Singh Vs. M/s Neo Developers Private Limited	Sh. Rajiv Vig (Advocate) Sh. Dushyant (Advocate)
2.	CR/2583/2025	Meena Devi and Abhishek Singh Vs. M/s Neo Developers Private Limited	Sh. Rajiv Vig (Advocate) Sh. Dushyant (Advocate)

CORAM:

Shri Arun Kumar

Chairman**ORDER**

1. This order shall dispose of the aforesaid complaints titled above filed before this authority 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/MOU 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, **Neo Square** Sector 109, Gurugram being developed by the same respondent/promoter i.e., **M/s Neo Developers Pvt. Ltd.** The terms and conditions of the buyer's agreements/MoU and 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 valid offer of possession of the unit along with assured return, waiver of fit out charges and other reliefs.
3. The details of the complaints, reply 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	"Neo Square", sector 109, Gurugram, Haryana
Nature of the project	Commercial
Project area	3.08 acres
Occupation certificate	14.08.2024

Sr. No.	Complaint No., Case Title, and Date of filing of complaint	Unit no. & size	Date of execution of BBA /MoU	Assured Return Clause	Total Sale Consideration / Total Amount paid by the complainant	Offer of possession /Date of lease Deed
1	CR/2582/2025 Amita Singh Vs. M/s Neo Developers Pvt. Ltd. DOF: 30.05.2025 Reply: 12.11.2025	3 rd floor 331 sq. ft. (page 14 of complaint)	BBA: 16.02.2019 (page 28 of complaint) MOU: 16.02.2019 (page 12 of complaint)	4. The Company shall pay a penalty of Rs.33,070/- per month on the said unit. On the total amount received with effect from 16.02.2020 Subject to TDS, cess or any other levy which is due and payable by the Allottee and which shall be adjusted in Total Sale Consideration, the balance total sale consideration which shall be payable by the Allottee to the Company in	T.S.C: Rs. 19,28,075/- (as per payment plan on page no. 45 of complaint) A.P.: Rs. 18,53,600/-	O.O.P: 05.11.2024

				<i>accordance with the Payment Schedule annexed as Annexure- I. The Penalty shall be paid to the Allottee from the end of effective date II until the offer of possession letter date, on prorata basis.</i>		
2	CR/2583/2025 Meena Devi and Abhishek Singh Vs. M/s Neo Developers Pvt. Ltd. DOF: 30.05.2025 Reply: 12.11.2025	5 th floor 300 sq. ft. (page 14 of complaint)	BBA: NA MOU: 31.08.2018 (page 12 of complaint)	<i>4. The Company shall pay a monthly return of Rs. 19,500/- on the total amount received with effect from 31.08.2020 before deduction of Tax at Source and GST, cess or any other levy which is due and payable by the Allottee(s) to the Company and the balance sale consideration shall be payable by the Allottee(s) to the Company in accordance with the Payment Schedule annexed as Annexure-I. The monthly assured return shall be paid to the Allottee until the commencement of first lease on the said unit. This shall be paid from the effective date.</i>	T.S.C: Rs. 12,00,000/- (as per BBA on page no.141 of complaint) A.P.: Rs. 13,44,000/-	O.O.P: 07.10.2024

Note: In the table referred above certain abbreviations have been used. They are elaborated as follows:

Abbreviation	Full form
DOF	Date of filing of complaint
BBA	Builder Buyer's Agreement
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
TSC	Total sale consideration
AP	Amount paid by the allottee/s.
OOP	Offer Of Possession

4. The aforesaid complaints were filed by the complainant-allottee(s) against the promoter on account of violation of the builder buyer's agreement /MoU executed between the parties in respect of subject unit for not handing over the possession by the due date, seeking the delayed possession charges, assured return and other charges.
5. The facts of all the complaints filed by the complainant-allottee(s) are similar. Out of the above-mentioned cases, the particulars of lead case **CR/2582/2025 titled as Amita Singh Vs. M/s Neo Developers Pvt. Ltd.** are being taken into consideration for determining the rights of the allottee(s) qua the relief sought by them.

A. Project and unit related details.

6. 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/2582/2025 titled as Amita Singh Vs. M/s Neo Developers Pvt. Ltd.

S. N.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project	Neo Square, Sector-109, Gurugram
2.	Project area	2.71 acres
3.	Nature of the project	Commercial colony
4.	RERA Registered or not	Registered Vide no. 109 of 2017 dated 24.08.2017 valid upto 22.02.2024
5.	DTCP License no.	102 of 2008 dated 15.05.2008 valid upto 14.05.2025
6.	Unit no.	3 rd floor (page no. 14 of complaint)
7.	Unit area admeasuring	331 sq. ft. (page no. 14 of complaint)
8.	Date of MOU	16.02.2019 (page no. 12 of complaint)

9.	Buyer's agreement	16.02.2019 (Page no. 28 of complaint)
10.	Possession clause	3. The Company shall complete the construction of the said building within which the said space is located within 36 months from the date of execution of this Agreement or from start of construction, whichever is later and apply for grant of completion /occupancy certificate.
11.	Assured return Clause	4. <i>The Company shall pay a penalty of Rs.33,070/- per month on the said unit. On the total amount received with effect from 16.02.2020 Subject to TDS, cess or any other levy which is due and payable by the Allottee and which shall be adjusted in Total Sale Consideration, the balance total sale consideration which shall be payable by the Allottee to the Company in accordance with the Payment Schedule annexed as Annexure-1. The Penalty shall be paid to the Allottee from the end of effective date II until the offer of possession letter date, on prorata basis.</i> (page no. 15 of complaint)
12.	Date of start of construction	The Authority has decided the date of start of construction as 15.12.2015 which was agreed to be taken as date of start of construction for the same project in other matters. In CR/1329/2019 it was admitted by the respondent in his reply that the construction was started in the month of December 2015.
13.	Due date	16.08.2022 (Calculated from date of agreement being later + 6 months as per HARERA notification no. 9/3-2020 dated 26.05.2020 for the projects having completion date on or after 25.03.2020)
14.	Basic sale consideration	Rs. 19,28,075/- (as per payment plan at page 45 of complaint) Rs. 21,77,188/-

		(As per SOA at page no. 66 of reply)
15.	Amount paid by the complainant	Rs. 18,53,600/- (As per SOA at page no. 66 of reply)
16.	Occupation certificate	14.08.2024
17.	Offer of possession	05.11.2024 (page no. 64 of reply)

B. Facts of the complaint.

7. The complainants have made following submissions in the complaint:

- i. That on the representations and assurances of the respondent especially regarding payment of assured return from a particular date of booking the complainant agreed to book and consequently allotted commercial space measuring 331 sq. ft. on 3rd floor forming the part of the area designated for use of "Commercial Space as Food Court" in the aforesaid project at the rate of Rs.4526/- per sq. ft.
- ii. That thereafter a memorandum of understanding and buyer's agreement dated 16.02.2019 was executed between the respondent and the complainant which were got prepared by the respondent primarily keeping its own interests and benefits in mind.
- iii. That under clause 3 of MOU the respondent allotted unit priority allotment measuring 331 sq. ft. super built area on 3rd floor forming the part of the area designated for "Commercial Space as Food Court" at the rate of Rs.4526/- per sq. ft. totaling to Rs.14,98,106/- against which the complainant has already paid a total sum of Rs.18,53,600/- towards basic sale price, EDC, IDC & GST, the receipt of which was clearly admitted by the respondent in clause 4 of the said MOU. The respondent company undertook to complete the construction within 36 months from the date of execution of the agreement or from the

- start of construction whichever was later and apply for grant of completion / occupation certificate.
- iv. That under clause 4 of the MOU the respondent company undertook to pay a sum of Rs.33,070/- per month in respect of the aforesaid unit to the complainant from 16.02.2020 till the commencement of first lease of the said unit as per clause 4 of the MOU.
 - v. That under clause 9 to 10 of the MOU the obligation was on the respondent company to find out the proposed lessee to whom the aforesaid unit was to be leased out and to finalize the terms and condition of the lease deed in respect of the aforesaid unit and as stated above the liability of the respondent to pay monthly assured amount to the complainant is till the commencement of first lease of the said unit.
 - vi. However, the respondent company neither completed the construction of the commercial units/space within the stipulated period nor paid any assured amount to the complainant as promised in MOU dt.16.02.2019 w.e.f. 16.02.2020 and thus violated the provision of Section 11 (4) (a) of the Real Estate (R & D) Act, 2016.
 - vii. That the respondent vide letter dt.15.10.2020 informed the complainant that it shall pay the "Assured Return Amount" which the respondent was bound to pay under the terms and conditions of the MOU dt.16.02.2019 to the complainant at the time of handing over the possession of her aforesaid commercial unit which the complainant had no other option but to believe and accept.
 - viii. That the respondent thereafter asked the complainant to deposit the requisite fee of registration of the buyers agreement which the complainant deposited and later on, buyers agreement was registered on 10.08.2021

- ix. That the complainant thereafter made number of visits besides calling the officials of the respondent, during 2022 to 2024 to know the status of the project and her aforesaid commercial unit. However, the officials of the respondent kept on making one after another excuse and miserably failed to discharge their obligations under the MOU dt.16.02.2019.
- x. That the complainant thereafter along with some other similarly situated allottees of similar units in the same project got a legal notice dt.26.12.2024 issued and served upon the respondent company for payment of overdue assured return amount. It is submitted that a sum of Rs.27,64,404/- including interest had become due and payable by the respondent to the complainant towards overdue assured return amount.
- xi. However, the respondent neither gave any reply nor paid any amount to the complainant nor offered possession of her unit.
- xii. That the complainant thereafter got busy in her personal family matters and could not keep a tap and has recently come to know that the respondent has started offering possession of units to its allottees but with malafide intention to avoid payment of assured return amount to allottees making false, frivolous and baseless claims / demands and is also giving threats to cancel the allotment of units of other allottees. The complainant however has not received any communication from the respondent and reserves her right to raise her objection as and when any such demand and threat is received by her from the respondent.
- xiii. That a total sum of Rs.27,64,404/- including interest thereon @ 18% p.a. has become due and payable by the respondent to the complainant under the monthly assured return scheme as on 31.12.2024, when aforesaid legal notice was issued and the same has now increased to Rs.29,27,000/- as on

31.03.2025. It is submitted that the respondent has misappropriated and misutilizing the funds of the innocent allottees including complainant herein for its own benefits and therefore, failed to complete the construction in time as also failed to pay assured monthly return as promised by it to complainant and others. The respondent is charging compound interest on the defaults of the allottees and is therefore liable to pay interest @18% p.a. on outstanding assured return amount to the complainant.

C. Relief sought by the complainants

8. The complainants have sought the following relief(s):

- I. Direct the respondent to pay Rs.29,27,000/- including interest thereon @ 18% p.a., as has become due and payable by the respondent to the complainant under assured return scheme as per clause 4 of the MOU dt.16.02.2019 from 16.02.2020 till 31.03.2025.
- II. Direct the respondent to keep paying the aforesaid monthly assured amount pendente lite i.e. even after 31.03.2025 i.e. during the pendency of the present complaint and even thereafter till the commencement of first lease in respect of the aforesaid unit of the complainant as per clause 4 of the MOU dt.16.02.2019.
- III. The illegal demands of the respondent against the claimant, if any, for illegal charges beyond the specific terms and conditions of the MOU and BA dt.16.02.2019 may kindly be set-aside and the respondent may kindly be directed to adjust the legitimate dues, if any, of the aforesaid unit of the complainant from the overdue amount of assured return, as mentioned in relief clause (1) & (2) above, to be paid by the respondent to the complainant and respondent be directed to pay the balance assured return amount to the complainant immediately within a fixed time frame.

- IV. Direct the respondent to hand over the possession and execute the sale deed of the aforesaid commercial space / unit priority serial no.01 measuring 331 sq. ft. on 3rd floor.
- V. Restrain from cancelling and terminating the allotment of aforesaid commercial space measuring 331 sq. ft. on 3rd floor.

9. 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

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

- I. That the complainant with the intent to invest in the Real Estate Sector as an investor, approached the respondent and inquired about the project i.e., "NEO SQUARE", Sector-109, Gurugram, Haryana being developed by the respondent. That after being fully satisfied with the project and the approvals thereof, the complainant decided to apply to the respondent by submitting a booking application form dated 16.02.2019 whereby seeking allotment of Unit No. 1, admeasuring 331 sq. ft super area on the 1st floor of the project having a basic sale price of Rs.4526/-. The complainant, considering the future speculative gains, also opted for the investment return plan being floated by the respondent for the instant project.
- II. That since the complainant had opted for the investment return plan, a memorandum of understanding dated 16.02.2019 was executed between the Parties, which was a completely separate understanding between the parties in regard to the payment of assured returns in lieu of investment made by the complainant in the said project and leasing of the unit/space thereof. It is pertinent to mention herein that as per terms of the "MOU", the returns were

to be paid from 16.02.2020 till offer of possession. As per terms of the MOU, the complainant herein had duly authorised the respondent to put the said unit on lease.

- III. That by no stretch of imagination it can be concluded that the complainant herein are "allottee/consumer." The complainant is simply investors who approached the respondent for investment opportunities and for a steady assured returns and rental income. That the same was duly agreed between the parties in the documents executed therein.
- IV. That the MOU executed between the parties was in the form of an "Investment Agreement." Therefore, the allotment of the said unit contained a "Lease Clause" which empowers the developer to put a unit of complainant along with the other commercial space unit on lease and does not have possession clauses, for handing over the physical possession. Hence, the embargo of the Authority, in totality, does not exist.
- V. That in any case whatsoever, the aspect of leasing of the unit and the investment of the complainant cannot be dealt with by this Authority. That the respondent had been rightly obliging with the payments of committed returns to be made by it.
- VI. That the complainant voluntarily also executed the buyer agreement dated 16.02.2019 for Shop no. 1 on 1st floor admeasuring 331 sq. ft. super area in the project.
- VII. That the relief of assured return is not maintainable before the Authority upon enactment of the BUDS Act. That any direction for payment of assured return shall be tantamount to violation of the provisions of the BUDS Act.
- VIII. That under the Scheme of the RERA Act 2016 there is no provision for examining and deciding the issues relating to the provisions of assured return,

also the Authority has no jurisdiction to entertain an application for enforcement of an agreement of assured return on investment, which is separate from the agreement of sale or allotment, which grants right in immovable property.

- IX. That a perusal of Section 13 (2) would show that assured return is not a matter which is contemplated to be included in the agreement of sale. In fact, the same arises from a separate agreement and is in no manner arising out of any provision of the RERA 2016.
- X. That the RERA Act, specifically provides for the matters which are mandatory to be included, this attains more importance where the project was an ongoing project and provisions of the act were being made applicable, in such a situation, a strict interpretation of the statutory provisions is being mandated.
- XI. That the governing section for registration also only requires the submission of an agreement of sale, matters of which are covered under Section 13. Section 13 nowhere mentions the Agreements pertaining to Assured Return are covered under the Act, 2016.
- XII. That the issues on which a complaint can be filed under the provisions of RERA 2016, are also clearly demarcated under Section 31 of the Act. Further, the Provisions of Section 34 (f) indicate the intent of the legislature, in relation to the obligations upon the various parties. A perusal of the same provisions would show that the RERA 2016 only envisages the enforcement of the Act and Rules/Regulations made there under.
- XIII. That assured return is not a matter contemplated under any provision of RERA 2016 and thus the assumption of jurisdiction by the authority is wholly illegal and unsustainable in the eyes of law. In this regard the provisions of Section 11 highlight the scope of the functions of the Promoter, as envisaged under the Act.

The same also, so do not impose any obligations in relation to returns of investment.

- XIV. That in exercise of powers under section 84 of the Act, the Government of Haryana has enacted the "Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017". The Rules in Rules 3 and 4 specifically provide the matters in respect of which disclosures are to be made by the promotor and in particular the promotor in relation to an ongoing project. The rules also keep "assured return" out of their scope. Rule 8 provides a clear indication as to the matters which are to be covered under the Agreement of Sale. The Authority has no jurisdiction to enlarge a matter which is duly provided for by statute.
- XV. That even in case of a newly registered project, assured return is not a matter which would be included in the agreement of sale. The Rule clearly indicated the extent to which the rights of the allottees are protected, is the matters contained in the agreement, form of which is provided under the rules. That even this agreement does not contain any condition governing assured returns. Thus, any order of payment of Assured Return would go beyond the statute and assumed jurisdiction in a wholly illegal manner.
- XVI. In this regard the aims and object and the obligations and compliances required to be made by a promoter as enshrined in the Act, 2016 may be examined. The assured return is an independent commercial arrangement between the parties which sometime a promoter/developer offer, in order to attract buyers/investors or users who may invest either in under construction or pre-launched/new launched projects. The commercial effect would generally involve transactions having profit as their main aim. Piecing the threads together, therefore, so long as an amount is 'raised' under a real estate agreement, which is done with profit as the main aim. Such agreement between

the developer and home buyer would have the "commercial effect" as both the parties have "commercial" interest in the same- the real estate developer seeking to make a profit on the sale of the apartment, and the flat/apartment purchaser profiting by the sale of the apartment. Whereas the object of promulgation of Act 2016 aims to create and ensure sale of immovable property in efficient and transparent manner and to protect the interest of the consumers in the real estate sector and not for the profit purposes.

- XVII. On the basis of the above, it may be considered that there is no provision under the Scheme of Act 2016 for examining and deciding the issues relating to the provisions of assured return in an allotment letter/builder buyer agreement for purchase of flat/apartment/plot.
- XVIII. Also, a perusal of the Section 2(d) defining allottee as well as Section 2 (zk) which defines "Promoter" does not include any transaction regarding "assured return". Therefore, the Assured Return scheme is beyond the scope of the Act, 2016 and jurisdiction of the Authority.
- XIX. That as per the provisions of the Act, 2016, the Authority is dressed with the jurisdiction to adjudicate upon all the complaints arising out of failure of either party to fulfil the terms and conditions of the Agreement for Sale (Buyer's Agreement). However, in the present matter the complainant is relying upon the terms of mou which is a distinct agreement than the Buyer's agreement and thus, the MOU is not covered under the provisions of the Act, 2016. The said complaint is not maintainable on this basis that there exists no relationship of builder-allottee in terms of the MOU, by virtue of which the complainant is raising their grievance.
- XX. That the buyer's agreement and the assured return agreement both contain rights and obligations of parties which are not identical of each other.

Therefore, both these documents cannot be treated as a single document enumerating the same rights and obligations. The reliance is place on the judgement of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the matter of M/s Serenity Real Estate Private Limited Vs. Blue Coast Infrastructure Development Pvt. Ltd. (Arb. P. 796/2016) wherein the Hon'ble High Court held as under:

- XXI. "11. It is apparent from the above that the Arbitration clause in the Assured Return Agreement is materially different from the Arbitration clause contained in the Space Agreement. Although the Agreements are connected the rights and obligations of the parties under the said agreements are not identical. Thus, it is difficult to accept the Respondent's contention that the arbitration clause in the space agreement would prevail over the Arbitration clause in the later agreement.
- XXII. Thus, in view of the above, the present complaint is arising out of the MOU which is not maintainable before the Authority and thus, the present complaint is liable to be dismissed.
- XXIII. That on 21.02.2019 the Central Government passed an ordinance "Banning of Unregulated Deposits, 2019", to stop the menace of unregulated deposits and payment of returns on such unregulated deposits.
- XXIV. Thereafter, an act titled as "The Banning of Unregulated Deposits Schemes Act, 2019" (hereinafter referred to as "the BUDS Act") notified on 31.07.2019 and came into force. That under the said Act all the unregulated deposit schemes have been banned and made punishable with strict penal provisions. That being a law-abiding company, the Respondent upon the introduction of BUDS Act, cease to make further payments pertaining to Assured Return to the Allottees/Complainant due above said prevailing confusion/anomaly. The preamble of the act reads as under:

- XXV. "An Act to provide for a comprehensive mechanism to ban the unregulated deposit schemes, other than deposits taken in the ordinary course of business, and to protect the interest of depositors and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto."
- XXVI. That on bare reading of above preamble it is clear that the intention behind notifying the act is to ban the unregulated deposit schemes to protect the interest of depositor.
- XXVII. Further, the BUDS Act provides two forms of deposit schemes, namely Regulated Deposit Schemes and Unregulated Deposit Schemes. Thus, for any deposit scheme, for not to fall foul of the provisions of the BUDS Act, must satisfy the requirement of being a 'Regulated Deposit Scheme' as opposed to Unregulated Deposit Scheme. Hence, the main object of the BUDS Act is to provide for a comprehensive mechanism to ban Unregulated Deposit Scheme.
- XXVIII. That the BUDS Act is a central Act came subsequent to the Companies Act and the RERA Act, 2016, therefore, directing the respondent to pay assured returns shall be violation of the provisions of BUDS Act. That for any kind of deposits and return over it shall be tried and adjudicated as per the relevant provisions of the BUDS Act by the Competent Authority constituted under the Act.
- XXIX. Further, any orders or continuation of payment of assured return or any directions thereof may tantamount to contravention of the provisions of the BUDS Act.
- XXX. That the respondent has offered assured returns to the complainant in lieu of advance payments received in respect to a unit booked in the project. It is merely an offer of marketing whereby the immovable property is sold against a certain consideration and certain percentage whereof is offered as Assured Return over a period of time, which can be treated as passing on of discount as

price realization against such sale through the said offers is much higher and substantial amounts are received by the respondent at one go which works as working capital for development of project.

- XXXI. That recently a Writ Petition was filed before the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana in the matter of Vatika Ltd. Vs Union of India & Anr. - CWP-26740-2022, on similar grounds of directions passed for payment of Assured Return being completely contrary to the BUDS Act. That the Hon'ble High Court after hearing the initial arguments vide order dated 22.11.2022 was pleased to pass direction with respect to not taking coercive steps in criminal cases registered against the Petitioner therein, seeking recovery of deposits till the next date of hearing. Further, a Civil Writ Petition bearing no. 16896/2023 titled as "NEO Developers Pvt Ltd vs Union of India and Another" has been filed by the Respondent on similar grounds as in the supra case before the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court and the same is been connected by the Hon'ble High Court with the Civil Writ Petition - 26740-2022 and is pending adjudication.
- XXXII. That an Appeal bearing no. 95 of 2022, titled as Venetian LDF Project Limited vs Mohan Yadav, is already pending before the Hon'ble Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal (HREAT). Wherein, the Hon'ble Tribunal vide order dated 18.05.2022, has already stayed the order passed by this Authority, granting the relief of assured return in favour of the allottee. Also, an Appeal bearing no. 647 of 2021, titled as Vatika Limited vs Vinod Agarwal, is already pending before the Hon'ble Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal (HREAT). Wherein, the Hon'ble Tribunal vide order dated 27.01.2021, has already stayed the order passed by this Authority, granting the relief of assured return in favour of the allottee.

- XXXIII. That the as per Clause 11 of the 'MOU', the respondent was obligated to complete the construction of the said complex within 36 months from the date of execution of the MOU or from start of construction, whichever is later and apply for grant of completion/occupancy certificate.
- XXXIV. That as per Clause 5.2 of the agreement the construction completion date was the date when the application for grant of completion/occupancy certificate was made. Accordingly, as per Clause 11 of the MOU the due date of delivery of possession in the present case is 36 months i.e., to be calculated from 01.11.2016, and the due date of possession comes out to be 01.11.2019.
- XXXV. That the respondent from time-to-time issued demand request/reminders to the complainant to clear the outstanding dues against the booked unit. However, the complainant delayed the same for one or the other reasons. The complainant miserably failed to comply the payment plan under which the unit was allotted to the complainant and further on each and every occasion failed to remit the outstanding dues on time as and when demanded by the respondent. The complainant as per the records of the respondent had only paid Rs.18,53,600/- against the total due amount of Rs.21,77,188/-. There is still an outstanding due of Rs.3,23,590/- which is to be paid by the complainant against the unit booked as per the demand letter dated 05.11.2024.
- XXXVI. That as per the terms of the MOU the complainant explicitly agreed to the complainant that in case of the tenant desires any infrastructural changes in form of separate sewage arrangement or the gas pipeline or any other charges which involves expense on the part of the allottee(s), then in that event the same shall be paid by the respondent, strictly within the period of 15 days from the day of written notification by the company and if the respondent fails to come

forward to tender the payment as demanded by the complainant then in that event the complainant shall bear the same from its own pocket.

- XXXVII. That the allottee is not entitled to revoke, cancel, extend, terminate, neither shall be authorized to negotiate on the terms of the lease. The decision taken and terms negotiated by the company shall be final and binding on the allottee(s).
- XXXVIII. That complainant is trying to negotiate to the demand of respondent on Fit out, the respondent has raised the demand of Rs.3500/- per sq. ft to the complainant which is sum of Rs.13,67,030/- for getting the said unit fit out which is essential for getting the said unit leased out.
- XXXIX. That though the complainant may have cleared the basic sale price of the said commercial property, however, they are still liable to pay all other charges such as VAT, Interest, Registration Charges, Security Deposit, duties, taxes, levies etc. when demanded. The same has been clearly agreed to in various Clauses of the buyer agreement and MOU.
- XL. That the complainant failed to clear the outstanding dues of Rs.3,23,590/- payable against the unit. That the complainant has not obliged its duties as per the MOU & Buyer's Agreement and further has not made the payments as per the agreed timeline. In these circumstances, the complainant is estopped from raising any allegations against the respondent as the complainant himself is at fault.
- XLI. That the respondent is raising the VAT demands as per government regulations. The rate at which the respondent is charging the VAT amount is as per the provisions of the Haryana Value Added Tax Act 2003. Accordingly, the VAT amounts have been demanded from the complainant, as the same has been assessed and demanded by the competent Authority.

- XLII. That the respondent has not availed the Amnesty Scheme namely, Haryana Alternative Tax Compliance Scheme for Contractors, 2016, floated by the Government of Haryana, for the recovery of tax, interest, penalty or other dues payable under the said HVAT Act, 2003. To further substantiated the same, the name of the Respondent is not appearing in the list of Builders, as circulated by the Excise & Taxation Department Haryana, who have opted for the Lumpsum Scheme/Amnesty Scheme under Rule 49A of HVAT Rules, 2003.
- XLIII. That the demand of VAT is done as per Clause 11 of the Buyer's Agreement. The said clause clearly states that the Allottee is liable to pay interest on all delayed payment of taxes, charges etc. The complainant is liable to pay the VAT demands as the respondent has not availed any amnesty scheme.
- XLIV. That as per the agreement so signed and acknowledged, the completion of the said unit was subject to the midway hindrances which were beyond the control of the respondent. And, in case the construction of the said commercial unit was delayed due to such 'Force Majeure' conditions the respondent was entitled for extension of time period for completion.
- XLV. That a period of 582 days was consumed on account of circumstances beyond the power and control of the respondent, owing to the passing of orders by the statutory authorities. All the circumstances come within the meaning of force majeure. Thus, the respondent has been prevented by circumstances beyond its power and control from undertaking the implementation of the project during the time period indicated and therefore the same is not to be taken into reckoning while computing the period of 48 as has been provided in the agreement. In a similar case where such orders were brought before the Hon'ble Authority in the Complaint No. 3890 of 2021 titled "Shuchi Sur and Anr vs. M/S Venetian LDF Projects LLP" decided on 17.05.2022, the Hon'ble

Authority was pleased to allow the grace period and hence, the benefit of the above affected 582 days need to be rightly given to the respondent builder.

XLVI. That since inception the respondent herein was committed to complete the project, however, the development was delayed due to the reasons beyond the control of the respondent. That due to the above reasons the project in question got delayed from its scheduled timeline. However, the respondent has completed the said project in all aspect and obtained the completion certificate from the office of DTCP.

11. All other averments made in the complaint were denied in toto.

12. 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

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

E.I Territorial jurisdiction

14. As per notification no. *1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017* issued by Town and Country Planning Department, the jurisdiction of Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram District for all purpose with offices situated in Gurugram. In the present case, the project in question is situated within the planning area of Gurugram District. Therefore, this authority has complete territorial jurisdiction to deal with the present complaint.

E.II Subject matter jurisdiction

15. 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.

16. 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 the respondent:

F.I Objection regarding maintainability of complaint on account of complainants being the investors.

17. The respondent took a stand that the complainants are the investors and not the consumers and therefore, they are not entitled to protection of the Act and thereby not entitled to file the complaint under section 31 of the Act. However, it is pertinent to note that any aggrieved person can file a complaint against the promoter if he contravenes or violates any provisions of the Act or rules or regulations made thereunder. Upon careful perusal of all the terms and conditions of the MoU, it is revealed that the complainants are the buyers, and have paid a considerable amount to the respondent-promoter towards purchase of unit in its project. At this stage, it is important to stress upon the definition of term allottee under the Act, the same is reproduced below for ready reference:

"2(d) "allottee" in relation to a real estate project means the person to whom a plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, has been allotted, sold (whether as freehold or leasehold) or otherwise transferred by the promoter, and includes the person who subsequently acquires the said

allotment through sale, transfer or otherwise but does not include a person to whom such plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, is given on rent;"

18. In view of the above-mentioned definition of "allottee" as well as all the terms and conditions of the MoU executed between the parties, it is crystal clear that the complainants are the allottees as the subject unit was allotted to them by the promoter vide said MoU dated 16.02.2019. The concept of investor is not defined or referred to in the Act. As per the definition given under Section 2 of the Act, there will be "promoter" and "allottee" and there cannot be a party having a status of an "investor". Thus, the contention of the promoter that the allottees being the investors are not entitled to protection of this Act also stands rejected.

G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainants.

G.I Direct the respondent to pay Rs.29,27,000/- including interest thereon @ 18% p.a., as has become due and payable by the respondent to the complainant under assured return scheme as per clause 4 of the MOU dt.16.02.2019 from 16.02.2020 till 31.03.2025.

G. II. Direct the respondent to keep paying the aforesaid monthly assured amount pendente lite i.e. even after 31.03.2025 i.e. during the pendency of the present complaint and even thereafter till the commencement of first lease in respect of the aforesaid unit of the complainant as per clause 4 of the MOU dt.16.02.2019. .

19. The complainant is seeking unpaid assured returns on monthly basis as per the terms of the MoU at the rates mentioned therein. It is pleaded that the respondent has not complied with the terms and conditions of the said MoU.

20. The respondent has submitted that the complainant in the present complaint is claiming the reliefs on basis of the terms agreed under the MoU between the parties which is a distinct agreement than the buyer's agreement and thus, the MoU is not covered under the provisions of the Act, 2016. Thus, the said

complaint is not maintainable on this basis that there exists no relationship of builder-allottee in terms of the MoU, by virtue of which the complainant is raising her grievance.

21. It is pleaded on behalf of respondent/builder that after the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act of 2019 came into force, there is bar for payment of assured returns to an allottee. But the plea advanced in this regard is devoid of merit. Section 2(4) of the above mentioned Act defines the word 'deposit' as *an amount of money received by way of an advance or loan or in any other form, by any deposit taker with a promise to return whether after a specified period or otherwise, either in cash or in kind or in the form of a specified service, with or without any benefit in the form of interest, bonus, profit or in any other form, but does not include:*

(i) an amount received in the course of, or for the purpose of business and bearing a genuine connection to such business including

(ii) advance received in connection with consideration of an immovable property, under an agreement or arrangement subject to the condition that such advance is adjusted against such immovable property as specified in terms of the agreement or arrangement.

22. A perusal of the above-mentioned definition of the term 'deposit', shows that it has been given the same meaning as assigned to it under the Companies Act, 2013 and the same provides under Section 2(31) includes any receipt by way of deposit or loan or in any other form by a company but does not include such categories of, amount as may be prescribed in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India. Similarly Rule 2(c) of the Companies (Acceptance of Deposits) Rules, 2014 defines the meaning of deposit which includes any receipt of money by way of deposit or loan or in any other form by a company but does not include:

(i) as an advance, accounted for in any manner whatsoever, received in connection with consideration for on immovable property

(ii) as an advance received and as allowed by any sectoral regulator or in accordance with directions of Central or State Government;

23. So, keeping in view the above-mentioned provisions of the Act of 2019 and the Companies Act 2013, it is to be seen as to whether an allottee is entitled to assured returns in a case where he has deposited substantial amount of sale consideration against the allotment of a unit with the builder at the time of booking or immediately thereafter and as agreed upon between them.
24. The Government of India enacted the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019 to provide for a comprehensive mechanism to ban the unregulated deposit schemes, other than deposits taken in the ordinary course of business and to protect the interest of depositors and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto as defined in Section 2 (4) of the BUDS Act 2019.
25. The money was taken by the builder as a deposit in advance against allotment of immovable property and its possession was to be offered within a certain period. However, in view of taking sale consideration by way of advance, the builder promised certain amount by way of assured returns for a certain period. So, on his failure to fulfil that commitment, the allottee has a right to approach the authority for redressal of his grievances by way of filing a complaint.
26. The Authority under this Act has been regulating the advances received under the project and its various other aspects. So, the amount paid by the complainant to the builder is a regulated deposit accepted by the latter from the former against the immovable property to be transferred to the allottee later on. If the project in which the advance has been received by the developer from an allottee is an ongoing project as per Section 3(1) of the Act of 2016 then, the same would fall within the jurisdiction of the authority for giving the desired relief to the complainant besides initiating penal proceedings. The promoter is liable to pay that amount as agreed upon. Moreover, an agreement/MoU defines the builder-

buyer relationship. So, it can be said that the agreement for assured returns between the promoter and allottee arises out of the same relationship and is marked by the said memorandum of understanding.

27. In the present complaint, the assured return was payable as per clause 4 of the MoU dated 16.02.2019, which is reproduced below for the ready reference:

4.

*The Company shall pay a penalty of Rs.33,070/- per month on the said unit. On the total amount received with effect from 16.02.2020 Subject to TDS, cess or any other levy which is due and payable by the Allottee and which shall be adjusted in Total Sale Consideration, the balance total sale consideration which shall be payable by the Allottee to the Company in accordance with the Payment Schedule annexed as Annexure- I. The Penalty shall be paid to the Allottee from the end of effective date II **until the offer of possession letter date**, on prorata basis.*

28. Thus, as per the abovementioned clause the assured return was payable @Rs.33,070/- per month w.e.f. 16.02.2020, till offer of possession letter.

29. In light of the above, the Authority is of the view that as per the MoU dated 16.02.2019, it was obligation on part of the respondent to pay the assured return till the offer of possession. The occupation certificate for the project in question was obtained by the respondent on 14.08.2024 and subsequently unit was offered for possession on 05.11.2024. Accordingly, the respondent/promoter is liable to pay assured return to the complainant at the agreed rate i.e., @Rs. 33,070/- from the date i.e., 16.02.2020 till 05.11.2024 after deducting the amount already paid on account of assured return to the complainant.

G.III. The illegal demands of the respondent against the claimant, if any, for illegal charges beyond the specific terms and conditions of the MOU and BA dt.16.02.2019 may kindly be set-aside and the respondent may kindly be directed to adjust the legitimate dues, if any, of the aforesaid unit of the complainant from the overdue amount of assured return, as mentioned in relief clause (1) & (2) above, to be paid by the respondent to the

complainant and respondent be directed to pay the balance assured return amount to the complainant immediately within a fixed time frame.

30. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainants which is not part of the MoU or buyers' agreement.

G. IV. Direct the respondent to hand over the possession and execute the sale deed of the aforesaid commercial space / unit priority serial no.01 measuring 331 sq. ft. on 3rd floor.

G.V Restrain from cancelling and terminating the allotment of aforesaid commercial space measuring 331 sq. ft. on 3rd floor.

31. The complainant is seeking relief w.r.t the handing over of possession. The Authority observes that the occupation certificate for the project was received on 14.08.2024 and subsequently the respondent has offered the possession of the unit on 05.11.2024. Therefore, the respondent is directed to handover the possession of the unit within 60 days of this order.

H.Directions of the authority

32. 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):

- i. The respondent/promoter is directed to pay the assured return to the complainants per month as per the MoU dated 16.02.2019 at the agreed rate i.e., @Rs. 33,070/- per month from the date i.e., 16.02.2020 till 05.11.2024 after deducting the amount already paid on account of assured return to the complainant.
- ii. In CR/2583/2025 the respondent/promoter is directed to pay assured return to the complainant per month as per the MoU dated 31.08.2018 at the agreed rate i.e., @Rs.19,500/- from the date i.e., 31.08.2020 till

07.10.2024 after deducting the amount already paid on account of assured return to the complainant.

- iii. The respondent/promoter is directed to pay the outstanding accrued assured return amount till date at the agreed rate within 90 days from the date of this order after adjustment of outstanding dues, if any, failing which that amount would be payable with interest @8.80% p.a. till the date of actual realization.
- iv. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainants which is not part of the MoU or buyers' agreement. The respondent is not entitled to charge holding charges from the complainants/ allottee at any point of time even after being part of the builder buyer's agreement as per law settled by *Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal nos. 3864-3889/2020 on 14.12.2020.*

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

34. The complaints stand disposed of.

35. Files be consigned to registry.



(Arun Kumar)
Chairman

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram
Dated:30.01.2026