BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, GURUGRAM

Complaint no:	**3279 of 2025**
Date of filing:	**15.07.2025**
First date of hearing	**24.09.2025**
Date of decision:	**29.09.2026**

Komal Saluja
R/o:- H.No.-456, Sector 20, Part-2, HUDA, Sirsa-125055 **Complainant**

Versus

Signature Global Homes Private Limited
Registered office: 13th floor, Dr, Gopal Das Bhawan, 28 Barakhamba Road, Connaught Place, Delhi-110001 **Respondent**

CORAM:
Shri Arun Kumar **Chairman**

APPEARANCE:
Sh. Jaswant Kataria (Advocate) Complainant
Shri Venket Rao (Advocate) Respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint has been filed by the complainant/allottee 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 thereunder or to the allottee 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 complainant, 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	Signature Global Park- IV, Village Hariyahara, Sector – 36, Gurugram, Haryana
2.	Nature of the project	Affordable Plotted Colony - Independent Floor
3.	DTCP License No.	117 of 2019 dated 12.09.2019 valid upto 11.09.2024
4.	Rera Registered/Not Registered	29 of 2020 dated 08.10.2020 (Page 31 of complaint)
5.	Welcome letter cum provisional allotment	08.02.2021 (page 19 of complaint)
6.	Unit no.	4 -A159- 2F, (Page no. 19 of complaint)
7.	Unit admeasuring	Carpet Area- 643.04 sq.ft. Balcony area-147.04 sq. ft. (Page no. 31 of complaint)
8.	Date of execution of agreement	12.03.2021 (Page no. 24 of complaint)
9.	Possession clause	**7. Possession of the plot** **7.1** The Promoter assures to handover possession of the Residential Independent Floor along with parking (applicable only if parking fee/charge has been paid) as per agreed terms and conditions by **30th July, 2022** unless there is delay due to "force majeure", Court orders, Government policy/guidelines, decisions, etc. affecting the regular development of the real estate project. If, the completion of the project is delayed due to the above conditions, then the Allottee agrees that the Promoter shall be entitled to the extension of time for delivery of possession of the Residential Independent Floor.

10.	Due date of delivery of possession	**30.07.2022**
11.	Total sale consideration	Rs. 58,13,370/- (As per Builder Buyer Agreement dated at Page no. 32 of the complaint)
12.	Total amount paid by the complainant	Rs. 58,50,720/- (as per customer ledger dated 26.09.2025, page 132 of reply)
13.	Occupation certificate	22.11.2022 (page 90-91 of reply)
14.	Offer of possession	21.02.2023 (Page no. 92 of the reply)
15.	Conveyance deed & Possession certificate	24.06.2024 (page 94 of reply)

B. Facts of the complaint:

3. The complainant has made the following submissions: -

a) That in 2019, the respondent promoter the project named Signature Global Park IV' situated at Sector 36, Gurugram, Haryana and approached the complainant with various flimsy promises. The said project was promised under Affordable Plotted Housing Policy, 2016 under Deen Dayal Jan Awas Yojna notified by Govt. of Haryana.

b) That believing to the fake promises of the respondent, the complainant booked on 08.02.2021, a residential independent floor no. 4-A159-2F, 2nd floor in block A having Super Built Up area 1081.67 sq.ft. containing carpet area 643.04 sq.ft. and balcony area of 147.04 sq.ft. at a price of Rs. 4500 per sq.ft. as per the brochure shown to the complainant by the sales person of the respondent.

c) That after receiving the booking amount, respondent exercising its undue position forced the locked-in complainant to enter into one-sided agreement for sale dated 12.03.2021 with inflated prices, and other onerous conditions upon the complainant. Also, the builder has suppressed the facts and charged the preferential location charges by adjusting the same in basic unit cost and

also violated the provisions of the policy under which the project was promoted by the builder.

d) That after payment of the booking amount, the complainant was under threats of cancellation and forfeiture of booking amount and had no other option than to execute the BBA with inflated prices and onerous conditions.

e) That vide the BBA, respondent had assured for the possession of said unit by July, 2022 and also assured to pay penalty and compensation in case of delay in handing over of possession.

f) That it was agreed at the time of booking that the charges of Rs. 4,500/- per sq. ft. shall be charged only upon the carpet area. However, at the time of execution of the BBA, the respondent altered the agreement and mentioned the extremely inappropriate price of Rs. 58,13,370/-. The said Total price mentioned in the BBA is not in consonance to proposal of the respondent as made before the booking or in the brochure. Also, no preferential location charges were agreed to be paid in BBA as the unit of the complainant does not pertains to preferential location and the same is apparent from the BBA also. However, as an after-thought, respondent is now justifying the inflated prices as PLC, over and above the basic price, which was neither presented to the complainant nor agreed by the complainant.

g) That the complainant has written the email asking about the overcharging of cost as per agreed terms and the respondent admitted that 5% PLC has been charged on the basic cost.

h) That the complainant being diligent made all the payment to the respondent as per the demands made by the respondent in the believe that the respondent shall deliver the unit within the proposed timelines. However, the respondent drastically defaulted to comply to the timeline. Later, the construction was progressing at snail pace and the due date of possession was default by the respondent but no penalty or compensation as proposed in the BBA were paid

to the complainant. Further, after long default of more than a year, the respondent claimed to receive the Occupancy Certificate for the project but neither shared the same with the complainant nor offered the possession as per the prescribed law.

i) That after huge delay, the possession was offered by the respondent vide offer of possession dated 21.02.2023 without sharing a copy of the Occupancy Certificate. When the complainant visited the site to inspect the unit, the condition of the project was such a bad shape that neither the lift was installed nor the stairs were complete. The complainant was not even able to access the unit incomplete infrastructure at the time when the respondent proposed to deliver the possession.

j) That the complainant raised the objection to the said offer of possession, the respondent completely turned a blind eye and all the efforts of the complainant were in vain. Furthermore, the respondent pressed a condition upon the complainant to execute the conveyance deed even before inspecting the unit and threatened the complaint of cancellation and forfeiture of amount paid.

k) That the complainant also admitted vide email dated 25.06.2024 that the possession process will start after 45-60 days of the execution of the conveyance deed.

l) That in response to the various emails asking for possession, the respondent on 15.02.2024 has written an email to the complainant to execute the indemnity bond and the one-sided relevant clause of the of indemnity bond is as under:

> *That Possession of unit is only given to us for specifically above stated purposes & after 20 days from the date of execution of this deed, I shall handover the Possession of unit to Developer company & in any circumstances same shall not be used for habitation purposes."*

m) That the complainant has refused to take the conditional possession for Hawan pooja only as the complainant has seeking the possession to use the unit on permanent basis and again wrote an email dated 06.05.2024 seeking the handover the possession.

n) That the complainant, under exorbitant pressure and influence, agreed to bow down to the illegal and unlawful conditions imposed by the respondent and thereafter the conveyance deed dated 24.06.2024 was executed between the parties. which is registered at Tehsil Sohna, District Gurugram, Haryana and only after the execution of Conveyance deed dated 24.06.2024, the Respondent offered the possession of the said unit to the Complainant on 30.06.2024.

o) That the respondent has also recovered illegal and unlawful charges from the complainant and has till dated received Rs. 59,52,981/- without any explanation. Due to such illegal acts of the respondent the affordability of the said unit as guaranteed by the DDJAY Policy has vanished and the lower/medium class complainant has to suffer in order to incur illicit profits gained by the respondent.

p) That till date, the complainant has not received the and delayed possession charges, penalty, compensation for the default of the respondent and delay in offer of possession.

q) That the respondent has gained undue enrichment to itself by collecting huge sums from the complainant without forwarding any benefits to him. The complainant, due to the violations done by the respondent, has lost rent/profit for more than complainant has also lost the value of money which 1.5 years. The is deposited with the respondent since past years. The complainant has also suffered mental agony and harassment as he has been following the respondent via various ways of communication but, all efforts of the complainant went in vain.

r) That the respondent has also incorporated one-sided clauses in the BBA which are to its advantage and prejudicial to the interest of the complainant and are liable to be quashed.

s) That no other complaint pertaining to the subject unit is pending before the Authority or any other competent Authority.

C. Relief sought by the complainant:

4. The complainant has sought following relief(s):

I. Direct the respondent to pay delay possession charges.
II. Direct the respondent to quash the illegal demands raised by the respondent in the name of PLC or otherwise which were never agreed by the complainant and direct to refund of the same along with interest.
III. Direct the respondent to compensate the complainant for the rent paid by the complainant after issuing of OOP and for not handing over the possession before execution of CD.
IV. Direct the respondent not to charge anything which is not a part of the agreement.

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 contested the complaint on the following grounds:

a) That on 08.02.2021, the complainant applied for allotment of an independent floor in the project of the respondent. Pursuant to the application for allotment, an independent floor was allotted vide allotment letter dated 08.02.2021 to the complainant bearing 4-A159-2F in block/tower- A, on having super buildup area of 1081.67 sq. ft. having carpet area of 643.04 sq. ft. and balcony area of 147.04 sq. ft. along with stilt parking.

b) That on 12.03.2021, an agreement to sell, was executed for the said unit having a sale price of Rs. 58,13,370/-, excluding all other charges, taxes etc. as mentioned and agreed by the complainant under the agreement. It is to

note, that the said agreement was signed by the complainant voluntarily with free will and consent without any demur.

c) That only after the due diligence, verification was done, and post being fully satisfied with the project the complainant had applied for the unit.

d) That as per the provision of clause 7.1 of the agreement, the possession of the unit was proposed to be offered by 30th July, 2022 unless there is a delay or failure due to force majeure events.

e) That as per the provision of clause 7.1 of the Agreement, the possession of an independent floor was proposed to be offered by 30th July 2022. However, the said time period for the offer of possession was subject to *force majeure* circumstances. The respondent had carried out its obligations in the agreement with utmost diligence.

f) That as per Clause 5.1 of the agreement, the Respondent is entitled for an extension of timeline affected due to *force majeure* circumstances.

g) That the committed date of possession fall at the time of Covid-19 when the entire nation was under lockdown and considering the same the Ministry of Finance (MOF) vide Office Memorandum No. F.18/4/2020-PPD, dated 13.05.2020, had considered the period of covid-19 lockdown as *force-majeure* circumstance and had allowed the parties to the contract with an extension of 6 (six) months period for fulfilling the contractual obligations. Further, the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs vide Office Memorandum no. O-17024/230/2018-Housing-UD/EFS-9056405, dated 13.05.2020, had considered the said covid-19 situation as *force majeure* for real estate projects and advised the Regulatory Authorities to extend the registration date, completion date, revised completion date and extended completion date automatically by 6 (six) months due to outbreak of covid 19.

h) That further, the Ld. Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority at Panchkula upon considering the obstructions/challenges faced by various Real Estate

Developers due to second wave of Covid–19, had allowed special extension of 3 months from 01.04.2021 to 30.06.2021, considering the same as *force majeure* event. Thus, the respondent is entitled for 3 months extension for completion of the project. In the interest of justice, the Respondent being a ***bona-fide*** may also be entitled to an extension for the inadvertent delay so caused in the construction of the Project owing to the world-wide Covid-19 pandemic.

i) That construction of real estate projects in Delhi NCR region was put on halt on various occasions by the various Courts, Authorities etc., to mitigate the adverse effects of the pollution. Due to such ban on construction, the promoter was constrained to halt the development work in compliance of various order which effected the timely completion of the project. The said delay was completely beyond the control of the respondent and thus, the respondent is entitled for extension for such period of delay. The details of force majeure circumstances and reasons beyond the control of the Respondent are highlighted in the table below:

SN	AUTHORITIES / DATE OF ORDER	TITLE	DURATION OF BAN
1.	Environment Pollution (Prevention and Control Authority) order dated 07.11.2017		90 days
2.	Haryana State Pollution Control Board order dated 29.10.2018		01.11.2018-10.11.2018 **(10 days)**
3.	Directions vide Notification DPCC/PA to MS/2018/7919-7945 dated 24.12.2018		**3 days**
4.	Commissioner, Municipal Corporation , Gurugram order dated 11.10.2019		11.10.2019-31.12.2019 **81 days**
5.	Environment Pollution (Prevention and Control		01.11.2019-05.11.2019 **5 days**

	Authority) for NCR order dated 01.11.2019		
6.	Supreme Court – 04.11.2019 - 14.02.2020	M. C. Mehta Vs. UOI WPC 13029 / 1985	(55days)
7.	Covid-19 extension (First Wave)- HRERA, Gurugram / 26.05.2020	Order dated 26.05.2020	6 Months extension
8.	Covid-19 extension (Second Wave) HRERA, Panchkula / 02.08.2021	Extract of the Resolution passed in the meeting dated 02.08.2021,	3 months extension
9.	Commission for Air Quality Management (NCR and Adjoining Areas) / 16.11.2021	Order dated 16.11.2021	16.11.2021 to 21.11.2021 (6 days)
TOTAL		**1.4yrs. (approx.)**	

j) That the delay was caused due to unforeseen circumstances as mentioned above, shall be considered and exempted while determining the due date to offer possession. Further, it is noteworthy to mention here that after the completion of the project and receiving the Occupancy Certificate on 22.11.2022, the possession was offered to the complainant vide offer of possession letter dated 21.02.2023. Thereafter, the conveyance deed has been executed on 24.06.2024 and the possession has been taken over by the complainant vide possession letter dated 24.06.2023. Furthermore, in the possession certificate, the complainant has voluntarily waived off his right by himself being satisfied with all the terms and conditions of the agreement.

k) That the complainant herein had defaulted in making the payment at various instances as per the Affordable Housing policy and the schedule of payment as agreed under the agreement. The majority of times, the payment from the complainant was received after the lapse of stipulated time period which led to levying of late payment charges on the complainant as per the policy. The

same is evident from the statement of account wherein the payment entries shows that at various occasions, the complainant had paid late payment charges due to default in making timely payments.

l) That the project in question has already been completed, an occupation certificate was obtained on 22.11.2022, the possession was offered on 21.02.2024 well within the timeline of the project as stipulated in the agreement. Further, the conveyance deed was executed on 24.06.2024.

m) That the entire case of the complainant is nothing but a web of lies, false and frivolous allegations made against the respondent. The Authority that the Complainant is trying to hoodwink the Ld. Authority by placing untrue facts and attempting to hide the true colour of intention.

n) That there exists no cause of action as much as in favour of the complainant or against the respondent, and the complaint under reply is liable to be dismissed as per the facts and averments as explained hereinabove. Hence, the present complaint under reply is liable to be dismissed with cost for wasting the precious time and resources of the Authority. The present complaint is an utter abuse of the process of law and hence deserves to be dismissed.

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

8. 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 those undisputed documents and oral as well as written submissions made by the parties.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

9. 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

10. 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

11. Section 11(4)(a) of the Act, 2016 provides that the promoter shall be responsible to the allottees 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."*

12. 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 complainant at a later stage.

F. Findings on the objections raised by the respondent.

F. I Objection regarding force majeure conditions.

13. The respondent /promoter raised a contention that the construction of the project was delayed due to force majeure conditions such as lockdown due to outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic which further led to shortage of labour and orders passed by National Green Tribunal (hereinafter, referred as NGT) and

various court orders. But all the pleas advanced in this regard are devoid of merit. The passing of various orders passed by NGT during the month of November is an annual feature and the respondent no.1 should have taken the same into consideration before fixing the due date. Similarly, the various orders passed by other authorities cannot be taken as an excuse for delay.

14. Further, the Authority has examined the possession clause of the agreement and observed that the respondent-promoter proposed to hand over possession of the allotted unit by 30.07.2022. As per HARERA Notification No. 9/3-2020 dated 26.05.2020, an extension of six months was granted for projects having a completion/due date on or after 25.03.2020. The completion date of the aforesaid project, in which the subject unit has been allotted to the complainant, is 30.07.2022, i.e., after 25.03.2020. However, in the present case, the builder buyer agreement was executed in the year 2021, therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the respondent was aware of the prevailing circumstances and agreed to the stipulated timeframe for possession accordingly. Consequently, any extension of time for handing over possession on account of COVID-19 cannot be granted, and the due date for handing over possession remains unchanged, i.e., 30.07.2022.

G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainant.

G.I Direct the respondent to pay delay possession charges.

15. The factual matrix of the case reveals that the complainant was allotted unit no. 4-A159-2F, Plot A-159, in the respondent's project at the sale consideration of Rs. 58,13,370/-. A buyer's agreement was executed between the parties on 12.03.2021. The possession of the unit was to be offered on or before 30.07.2022. The complainant paid a sum of Rs. 58,50,720/- towards the subject unit. The respondent obtained Occupation Certificate on 22.11.2022 from the competent authorities and offered possession of the unit to the complainant on 21.02.2023.

16. The complainant herein intends to continue with the project and is 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."*

17. **Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** The complainant is seeking delay possession charges. Proviso to Section 18 provides that where an allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, he shall be paid, by the promoters, 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, ibid. 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.*

18. The legislature in its wisdom in the subordinate legislation under the provision of Rule 15 of the Rules, ibid 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.

19. 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., 29.09.2026 is 8.80%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 10.80%.

20. 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—*
> *(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;"*

21. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainant shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 10.80% by the respondent/promoter which is the same as is being granted to them in case of delayed possession charges.

22. On consideration of the documents available on record and submissions made by both 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 agreement dated 12.03.2021. By virtue of clause 7.1 of the agreement for sale, the possession of the subject apartment was to be delivered by 30.07.2022. However, it is the failure of the promoter to fulfil its obligations and responsibilities as per the buyer's agreement to hand over the possession within the stipulated period. 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 is established. As such the complainant is entitled to delay possession charges at rate of the prescribed interest @ 10.80% p.a. w.e.f. 30.07.2022 till the date of offer of possession (21.02.2023) plus two months i.e., 21.04.2023 or actual handing over of possession, whichever is earlier as per proviso to Section 18(1) of the Act read with Rule 15 of the Rules, ibid.

G.II Direct the respondent to pay compensation & litigation cost.

23. The complainant is seeking above mentioned relief w.r.t. compensation &litigation cost. ***Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. V/s State of Up & Ors. 2021-2022(1) RCR (C), 357*** held that an allottee is entitled to claim compensation & litigation charges 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 & litigation expense 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 & legal expenses.

H. Directions of the Authority

24. 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 is directed pay interest at the prescribed rate i.e., 10.80% per annum for every month of delay on the amount paid by the complainant itself from due date of possession i.e., 30.07.2022 till the date of offer of possession (21.02.2023) plus two months i.e., up to 21.04.2023 or actual handing over of possession, whichever is earlier as per proviso to Section 18(1) of the Act read with Rule 15 of the Rules, ibid.

II. The respondent is directed to pay arrears of interest accrued so far within 90 days from the date of order of this order as per Rule 16(2) of the Rules, ibid.

III. The rate of interest chargeable from the allottees by the promoter, in case of default shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 10.80% 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.

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

25. Complaint stands disposed of.

26. File be consigned to registry.

(Arun Kumar)
Chairman
Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram
29.09.2026