

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

Complaint no: 4479 of 2020
First date of hearing: 15.01.2021
Date of decision : 24.03.2021

1. Mrs. Suman Govil
 2. Mr. Jivesh Govil
- Both RR/o: - A-63, Lok Vihar,
Pitampura New Delhi- 110034

Complainants

Versus

M/s Ramprashtha Promoters and
Developers Private Limited.
Regd. office: Plot No. 114, Sector-44,
Gurugram-122002.
Also at: - C-10, C-Block Market,
Vasant Vihar, New Delhi- 110057

Respondent

CORAM:

Dr. K.K Khandelwal
Shri Samir Kumar
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal

**Chairman
Member
Member**

INDEX

SR. NO.	PARTICULARS	PAGE NO.
1.	A. Unit and project related details	2-3
2.	B. Facts of the complaint	4-7
3.	C. Relief sought by complainant	7-7
4.	D. Reply by respondent	7-18
5.	E. Jurisdiction of the authority	18-19
6.	F. Findings of authority on the objections raised by respondent	19-27

7.	G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainant	27-33
8.	H. Directions of the authority	33-35

APPEARANCE:

Sh. Sushil Yadav
Sh. Dheeraj Kapoor

Advocate for the complainants
Advocate for the respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated 04.12.2020 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 provision of the Act or the rules and regulations made there under or to the allottee as per the agreement for sale executed *inter se*.

A. Unit and project related details

2. The particulars of the project, the details of 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:

S.No.	Heads	Information
-------	-------	-------------



1.	Project name and location	"Ramprastha City" Sector-37C & 37D, Gurugram.
2.	Project area	105.402 acres
3.	Nature of the project	Residential colony
4.	DTCP license no. and validity status	128 of 2012 dated 28.12.2012 valid till 27.12.2016
5.	Name of licensee	B.S.Y. Developers Pvt. Ltd. and 35 others
6.	RERA Registered/not registered	Registered/not Not Registered
7.	Unit no.	Plot No. 65, Tower B [Page 20 of complaint]
8.	Unit measuring	250 sq. yds.
9.	Allotment letter	16.11.2015 [Page 35 of complaint]
10.	Date of execution of Plot buyer agreement	18.11.2015 [Page 17 of complaint]
11.	Payment plan	Possession linked payment plan. [Page 33 of complaint]
12.	Total consideration	Rs.81,50,000/- [as per payment plan page no 33 of complainant]
13.	Total amount paid by the complainants	Rs.75,75,000 /- [as per receipt information page no 36&37 of complainant]
14.	Due date of delivery of possession as per clause 11 of the apartment buyer agreement: 30 months from the date of execution of agreement [Page 24 of complaint]	18.05.2018
15.	Delay in handing over possession till date of this order i.e. 24.03.2021	2 years 10 months and 6 days



B. Fact of the complaint

3. The complainants have submitted the respondent gave advertisement in various leading Newspapers about their forthcoming project named Ramprastha "The Ramprastha City" Sector 37C & 37D, Gurgaon promising various advantages, like world class amenities and timely completion/execution of the project etc. The companies staff member, channel partner "Accolades Developers" and the Ramprastha CEO (Mr. Nikhil Jain) had repeated visit to the residence of the complainant between July 2012 till September 2012 and assured the client by narrating that the company has acquired 500 acres of land and is developing into residential plot at Sec.37-D, Gurgaon. They all assured that the possession will be given in next 6 to 10 months' time. They all further narrated that the land is situated at prime place near proposed Metro Station and thus allured the complainant to invest their hard-earned money for immediate pre-launch offer of residential plot at Sec.37-D, Gurgaon. They further stated that the priority allotment will be done to those members who will pay full amount of plot along with External Development Charges and Infrastructure Development charges, inducing client for 95% upfront payment.



4. The complainants have submitted that relying on the promise and undertakings given by the respondent in the advertisements the complainants, booked a plot admeasuring 250 sq.ft. i.e. in aforesaid project of the respondent for total sale consideration of Rs.81,50,00/- which includes BSP, car parking, IFMS, Club Membership, PLC etc. That due to sudden demise of Sh. R.N Govil (joint holder), the plot was endorsed in the name of Smt. Suman Govil and Mr. Jivesh Govil on dated 28.10.2020.
5. The complainants have further submitted that Plot Buyers Agreement the respondent had allotted a Plot bearing No B-65 in Block-B having area of 250 Sq. yds. to the complainants. That as per para-No.11 of the plot buyer agreement, the respondent had agreed to deliver the possession of the Plot within 30 months from date of execution of the agreement plus a grace period of Six months, and he had made payment of Rs75,75,000/- to the respondent vide different cheques on different dates with 93% of total sale consideration completed by November 2015.
6. The complainants have submitted that he had regularly visited the site upto three times per years from 2015 to 2020 but was surprised to see that construction work has been initiated even after 5 years of payment and no one was



present at the site to address the queries of the complainant. It appears that respondent had malafide intentions to induce complainant to part with their hard-earned money. The only intention of the respondent was to take payments for the plot without completing any iota of work. The respondent had dishonest motives and intentions to cheat and defrauded the complainant by selling untruthful dreams. That despite receiving payments for all the demands raised by the respondent for the said plot and despite repeated requests and reminders over phone calls and personal visits of the complainants, the respondent has miserably failed to deliver the possession of the allotted plot to the complainants within stipulated period.

7. The complainants have submitted that the respondents in submitting their RERA application vide Project ID RERA-GRG-310-2019 on 19.09.2019 at RERA themselves acknowledged a completion status of 7.5%. They have further acknowledged in their application that they are yet to prepare any of the 14 listed service plans and have not applied/received approvals/NOC from any of the government agencies incl. electricity, water, drainage, drainage, etc. The respondents have also acknowledged not filling for statutory approvals including Forest NOC by 19.09.2019. The Respondents have



clearly been delinquent in administering their own responsibilities.

C. Relief sought by the complainant:

8. The complainant has sought following relief(s)

I. To direct the respondent to handover the possession of the plot along with prescribed interest per annum.

9. On the date of hearing, the Authority explained to the respondent/promoter about the contravention 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 filed an application for rejection of complaint on the ground of jurisdiction along with reply. The respondent has contested the complaint on the following grounds.

i. The complaint filed by the complainant is not maintainable and the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram, Haryana has no jurisdiction whatsoever to entertain the present complaint. According to the respondent, the jurisdiction to entertain the complaints pertaining to refund, possession, compensation, and interest as prescribed under sections 12, 14, 18 and section 19 of the Act lies

with the adjudicating officer under sections 31 and 71 of the Act read with rule 29 of the rules.

- ii. That the complaint pertains to the alleged delay in delivery of possession for which the complainant has filed the present complaint and is seeking relief of possession, interest, compensation under section 18 of the Act. Therefore, even though the project in question i.e. Ramprastha City at Sector 37C and 37D, Gurugram is covered under the definition of "ongoings projects" and RERA registration has been applied and the registration certificate is still awaited, the complainant, if any, is still required to be filed before the adjudicating officer under rule 29 of the rules and not before this authority under Rule 28, as this authority has no jurisdiction to entertain such complaint, thus, the same is liable to be rejected/dismissed.
- iii. That, in terms of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Amendment Rules, 2019 (for brevity RERA amendment Rules, 2019"), the complainants have filed the present complaint under the amended rule 28 in the amended form 'CRA' and is seeking the reliefs of possession, interest and compensation which is covered u/s 18 of the Act.



- iv. That the complaint is neither signed nor supported by any proper affidavit with a proper verification. In the absence of a signed complaint with a proper verified and attested affidavit supporting the complaint, the complaint is liable to be rejected.
- v. That the statement of objects and reasons as well as the preamble of the said Act clearly state that the RERA is enacted for effective consumer protection and to protect the interest of consumers in the real estate sector. RERA is not enacted to protect the interest of investors. As the said Act has not defined the term consumer, therefore the definition of "Consumer" as provided under the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 has to be referred for adjudication of the present complaint. The complainants are investors and not consumers as explained herein below:
- a) That the authority has no jurisdiction to entertain the present complaint as the complainant has not come to this authority with clean hands and has concealed the material fact that apart from the Plot No. B-65 in the said project, for which the complainant has filed the present complaint, the complainant, has also invested in one more plot i.e.



B-282 in the same project of the respondent, for which the complainant has filed a separate complaint i.e. complaint no. 4423/20, which is also pending adjudication before this authority. The complainant has invested in two residential units in the same project of the respondent for earning profits and the transaction therefore is relatable to commercial purpose and the complainant not being a 'consumer' within the meaning of Section 2(1)(d) of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986, the complaint itself is not maintainable under the said Act. This has been the consistent view of the Hon'ble National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission in a number of cases wherein it has been held that even when a consumer has booked more than one unit of residential premises; it amounts to booking of such premises for investment/commercial purpose.

- b) The complainant is not a consumer and nowhere in the present complaint have the complainants pleaded as to how the complainants are consumers as defined in the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 qua the respondent. The complainants have deliberately not pleaded the purpose for which the



complainants entered into an agreement with the respondent to purchase the apartment in question. The complainants, who are already the owners of A-63, Lok Vihar, Pitampura, New Delhi-110034 (address mentioned in the booking application form, plot buyer agreement and in the present complaint) are investors, having invested in two units in the same project of the respondent and who never had any intention to buy the apartment for their own personal use and kept on avoiding the performance of their contractual obligations and have now filed the present complaint on false and frivolous grounds.

- vi. Despite several adversities, the respondent has continued with the development of the said Project and is in the process of completing the development of the project and subject to the force majeure conditions, as detailed hereinafter, should be able to apply the Occupation/Part Completion Certificate by 31.12.2022 (as mentioned in the application filed for registration of the said Projects with RERA) or within such extended time, as may be extended by the Ld. Regulatory Authority, as the case may be. However, as the



complainants were only short term and speculative investors, therefore they were not interested in taking over the possession of the said apartment. It is apparent that the complainants had the motive and intention to make quick profit from sale of the said apartment through the process of allotment. Having failed to resell the said apartment due to general recession and because of slump in the real estate market, the complainants have developed an intention to raise false and frivolous issues to engage the respondents in unnecessary, protracted, and frivolous litigation. The alleged grievance of the complainants has origin and motive in sluggish real estate market.

- vii. The respondent has submitted that the authority is deprived of the jurisdiction to go into the interpretation of, or rights of the parties inter-se in accordance with the plot buyer's agreement signed by the complainants/allotment offered to him. It is a matter of record and rather a conceded position that no such agreement, as referred to under the provisions of said Act or rules, has been executed between the complainants and the respondent. Rather, the agreement that has been referred to, for the purpose of



getting the adjudication of the complaint, is the plot buyer agreement dated 18.11.2015, executed much prior to coming into force of said Act or said Rules. The adjudication of the complaint for interest and compensation, as provided under Sections 12, 14, 18 and 19 of said Act, has to be in reference to the agreement for sale executed in terms of Act and rules and no other agreement. This submission of the respondents *inter alia*, finds support from reading of the provisions of the Act and the rules. Thus, in view of the submissions made above, no relief can be granted to the complainants.

- viii. That the proposed estimated time of handing over the possession of the said plot i.e. 30 months + 6 months i.e. 36 months from the date of execution of plot buyer agreement (18.11.2015) which comes out to 18.11.2018, it is applicable to force majeure and the complainant has complied with all the terms and conditions and not being in default of any the terms and condition of the plot, including but not limited to the payments of instalments. In case of any default/delay in payment, the date of handing over possession shall be extended accordingly solely at the



respondent discretion, till the payment of all outstanding amounts and at the same time in case of any default the complainant will not be entitled to any compensation whatsoever, this was also provided in clause 11 of the plot buyer agreement.

- ix. That section 19(3) of the Act provides that the allottee shall be entitled to claim the possession of the apartment, plot, or building, as the case may be, as per the declaration given by the promoter under section 4(2)(I)(C). Thus, conjoint reading both the provisions, as aforementioned, would show that the entitlement to claim the possession or refund would only arise once the possession has not been handed over as per the declaration given by the promoter under section 4(2)(I)(C). In the present case, the respondent had made a declaration in terms of section 4(2)(I)(C) that it would complete the project by 31.12.2022 (as mentioned at the time of registration of the project with RERA) or within such extended time, as may be extended by the authority. Thus, no cause of action can be said to have arisen to the complainant in any event to claim possession or refund, along with interest and compensation, as sought to be claimed by it.

- x. The respondent has submitted that the respondent has developed various projects and has completed those projects. The respondent has obtained occupation certificate in majority of its project are described as under: -

S. No	Project Name	No. of Apartments	Status
1.	Atrium	336	OC received
2.	View	280	OC received
3.	Edge Tower I, J, K, L, M Tower H, N Tower-O (Nomenclature-P) (Tower A, B, C, D, E, F, G)	400 160 80 640	OC received OC received OC received OC to be applied
4.	EWS	534	OC received
5.	Skyz	684	OC to be applied
6.	Rise	322	OC to be applied

- xi. The respondent further submitted that he had, immediately after obtaining the License for the said project, started the process of demarcating the Plan by visiting the Project site physically several times in order to fasten the demarcation process. It is submitted



that the Respondent tried at least three times to demarcate the plan, however, there was always an issue in demarcation because the physical plan was not in consonance with the Sectoral Plan, which is the reason why the respondent took considerable amount of time to demarcate the colony. It was only in early 2014, the respondent at the time of demarcation of the colony, learnt that there had been several changes/mistakes in Sectoral Plan of Sectors 37C and Sector 37D on account of which, no development could have taken place over the licensed land on the basis of the Layout Plan that had been approved on September 28, 2012. As such, the respondent was constrained to make changes in the Layout Plan and submit an application for approval thereof, keeping in view the actual position existing at the site. Accordingly, an application dated April 7, 2014 had been submitted, seeking approval of the new Layout Plan. In the said application, some of the changes/mistakes, as appearing in the Sectoral Plans, had been highlighted, which for ease of reference, are reproduced hereunder:-

- That there is a HSIIDC Nala which is passing through the land adjoining to the Huda Nala in the village Gaduli Kalan, which is not shown in the approved Sectoral Plan of Sector 37-C and 37-D.
- There were no HT lines passing through the colony at the time when application had been submitted for approval of Layout Plan, but after the approval, Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam (DHBVN) had installed a HT line, which is passing through the plots, as had been demarcated in the approved Layout Plan, on account whereof, separate green corridors were needed to be created on the line through which HT lines had been installed.
- That a memo dated April 29, 2014 was sent through respondent office to the District Town Planner, Gurgaon, seeking to verify the road circulation *inter alia*, keeping in view that the boundary lines of Basai and Gaduli Kalan were wrong and were not as per sizra plans of those villages. Pertinently, though no development could even take place *inter alia*, for the reasons aforementioned, the applicant had to make compliances of Rules 24, 26, 27 and 28 of the 1976 Rules.



- That time and again, the respondent continued to inquire about the revised layout plan but there was no response from the authorities.

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

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

The application of the respondent regarding rejection of complaint on ground of jurisdiction stands rejected. 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

12. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town and Country Planning Department, Haryana 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



13. The respondent has contended that the relief regarding refund and compensation are within the jurisdiction of the adjudicating officer and jurisdiction w.r.t the same does not lie with the authority. It seems that the reply given by the respondent is without going through the facts of the complaint as the same is totally out of context. The complainant has nowhere sought the relief of refund and regarding compensation part the complainant has stated that he is reserving the right for compensation and at present he is seeking only delay possession charges. The authority has complete jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the promoter as held in *Simmi Sikka v/s M/s EMAAR MGF Land Ltd. (complaint no. 7 of 2018)* leaving aside compensation which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer if pursued by the complainants at a later stage. The said decision of the authority has been upheld by the Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal in its judgement dated 03.11.2020, in appeal nos. 52 & 64 of 2018 titled as *Emaar MGF Land Ltd. V. Simmi Sikka and anr.*

F. Finding on the objections raised by the respondent

F.I Objection regarding the complaint not signed and proper verified

14. The counsels for the respondents have raised objection that the complaint is neither signed nor supported by any proper



affidavit with a proper verification. The authority observes that the complaint is signed by the complainant and his counsel and affidavit is also signed by both the complainants. So the allegation of the respondent is liable to be dismissed.

F.II Objection regarding handing over possession as per declaration given under section 4(2)(I)(C) of RERA Act

15. The counsel for the respondent has stated that the entitlement to claim possession or refund would arise once the possession has not been handed over as per declaration given by the promoter under section 4(2)(I)(C). Therefore, next question of determination is whether the respondent is entitled to avail the time given to him by the authority at the time of registering the project under section 3 & 4 of the Act.
16. It is now settled law that the provisions of the Act and the rules are also applicable to ongoing project and the term ongoing project has been defined in rule 2(1)(o) of the rules. The new as well as the ongoing project are required to be registered under section 3 and section 4 of the Act.
17. Section 4(2)(I)(C) of the Act requires that while applying for registration of the real estate project, the promoter has to file a declaration under section 4(2)(I)(C) of the Act and the same is reproduced as under: -

Section 4: - Application for registration of real estate projects



(2) The promoter shall enclose the following documents along with the application referred to in sub-section (1), namely: —

.....

(1): -a declaration, supported by an affidavit, which shall be signed by the promoter or any person authorised by the promoter, stating: —

(C) the time period within which he undertakes to complete the project or phase thereof, as the case may be...."

18. The time period for handing over the possession is committed by the builder as per the relevant clause of plot buyer agreement and the commitment of the promoter regarding handing over of possession of the unit is taken accordingly. The new timeline indicated in respect of ongoing project by the promoter while making an application for registration of the project does not change the commitment of the promoter to hand over the possession by the due date as per the plot buyer's agreement. The new timeline as indicated by the promoter in the declaration under section 4(2)(1)(C) is now the new timeline as indicated by him for the completion of the project. Although, penal proceedings shall not be initiated against the builder for not meeting the committed due date of possession but now, if the promoter fails to complete the project in declared timeline, then he is liable for penal proceedings. The due date of possession as per the agreement remains unchanged and promoter is liable



for the consequences and obligations arising out of failure in handing over possession by the due date as committed by him in the plot buyer agreement and he is liable for the delayed possession charges as provided in proviso to section 18(1) of the Act. The same issue has been dealt by hon'ble Bombay High Court in case titled as *Neelkamal Realtors Suburban Pvt. Ltd. and anr. vs Union of India and ors.* and has observed 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..."

F.III Objection regarding entitlement of DPC on ground of complainant being investor.

19. The respondent has taken a stand that the complainants are the investors and not consumers, therefore, they are not entitled to the protection of the Act and thereby not entitled to file the complaint under section 31 of the Act. The respondent also submitted that the preamble of the Act states that the Act is enacted to protect the interest of consumers of the real estate sector. The authority observed that the respondent is correct in stating that the Act is enacted to protect the interest of consumers of the real estate sector. It



is settled principle of interpretation that preamble is an introduction of a statute and states main aims & objects of enacting a statute but at the same time preamble cannot be used to defeat the enacting provisions of the Act. Furthermore, it is pertinent to note that any aggrieved person can file a complaint against the promoter if the promoter 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 plot buyer's agreement, it is revealed that the complainants are buyer and they have paid total price of Rs.75,75,000/- to the promoter towards purchase of a plot in the project of the promoter. 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;"

In view of above-mentioned definition of "allottee" as well as all the terms and conditions of the plot buyer's agreement executed between promoter and complainant, it is crystal



clear that the complainant is allottee(s) as the subject unit was allotted to them by the promoter. The concept of investor is not defined or referred 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 "investor". The Maharashtra Real Estate Appellate Tribunal in its order dated 29.01.2019 in appeal no. 0006000000010557 titled as *M/s Srushti Sangam Developers Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Sarvapriya Leasing (P) Lts. And anr.* has also held that the concept of investor is not defined or referred in the Act. Thus, the contention of promoter that the allottee being an investor is not entitled to protection of this Act also stands rejected.

F.IV Objection regarding jurisdiction of authority w.r.t. buyer's agreement executed prior to coming into force of the Act

20. Another contention of the respondent is that authority is deprived of the jurisdiction to go into the interpretation of, or rights of the parties inter-se in accordance with the plot buyer agreement executed between the parties and no agreement for sale as referred to under the provisions of the Act or the said rules has been executed inter se parties. The authority is of the view that the Act nowhere provides, nor can be so construed, that all previous agreements will 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) 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."



21. 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."

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, statutes, instructions,

directions issued thereunder and are not unreasonable or exorbitant in nature.

G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainant.

Relief sought by the complainant: To direct the respondent to handover the possession of the plot along with prescribed interest per annum.

22. In the present complaint, the complainant 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."

23. Clause 11 of the plot buyer agreement (in short, agreement) provides for handing over of possession and is reproduced below:

"11. Schedule for possession

"The company shall endeavour to offer possession of the said plot, within thirty (30) months with another grace period of six (6) months from the date of execution of this Agreement subject to timely payment by the intending Allottee(s) of Total Price, stamp duty, registration charges and any other charges due and payable according to the payment plan."



24. At the outset it is relevant to comment on the preset possession clause of the agreement wherein the possession has been subjected to timely payment by the intending complainant of total price, stamp duty, registration charges and any other charges due and payable according to the payment plan. The drafting of this clause and incorporation of such conditions are not only vague and uncertain but so heavily loaded in favour of the promoter and against the allottee that even a single default by the allottee in making payment as per the plan may make the possession clause irrelevant for the purpose of allottee and the commitment date for handing over possession loses its meaning. The incorporation of such clause in the plot buyer's agreement by the promoter is just to evade the liability towards timely delivery of subject unit and to deprive the allottee of his right accruing after delay in possession. This is just to comment as to how the builder has misused his dominant position and drafted such mischievous clause in the agreement and the allottee is left with no option but to sign on the dotted lines.

25. **Admissibility of grace period:** The promoter has proposed to hand over the possession of the plot within 30 months from the date of execution of this agreement then after the expiry of grace period of 6 months from the said 30 months



subject to the intending allottee having paid all payments as per the payment plan and subject to the terms and conditions of this agreement. As a matter of record, the various receipts issued by the promoter/respondent company in favour of complainant/allottee which amount are approximately 90% of the total sale consideration. According to payment plan the allottee/complainant are fulfilled all certain terms and conditions of the agreement. The respondent has failed to provide any such document which can prove that the intending allottee has not done timely payment. Hence, the promoter/respondent company fails to provide the possession of the plot within stipulated time. Accordingly, this grace period of 6 months cannot be allowed to the promoter at this stage.

26. **Payment of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** 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.

27. 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. The Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal in **Emaar MGF Land Ltd. vs. Simmi Sikka (Supra)** observed as under: -

"64. Taking the case from another angle, the allottee was only entitled to the delayed possession charges/interest only at the rate of Rs.15/- per sq. ft. per month as per clause 18 of the Buyer's Agreement for the period of such delay; whereas, the promoter was entitled to interest @ 24% per annum compounded at the time of every succeeding instalment for the delayed payments. The functions of the Authority/Tribunal are to safeguard the interest of the aggrieved person, may be the allottee or the promoter. The rights of the parties are to be balanced and must be equitable. The promoter cannot be allowed to take undue advantage of his dominate position and to exploit the needs of the home buyers. This Tribunal is duty bound to take into consideration the legislative intent i.e., to protect the interest of the consumers/allottees in the real estate sector. The clauses of the Buyer's Agreement entered into between the parties are one-sided, unfair and unreasonable with respect to the grant of interest for delayed possession. There are various other clauses in the Buyer's Agreement which give sweeping powers to the promoter to cancel the allotment and forfeit the amount paid. Thus, the



terms and conditions of the Buyer's Agreement dated 09.05.2014 are ex-facie one-sided, unfair and unreasonable, and the same shall constitute the unfair trade practice on the part of the promoter. These types of discriminatory terms and conditions of the Buyer's Agreement will not be final and binding."

28. 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., 24.03.2021 is 7.30%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 9.30%.

29. 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;"

30. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainants shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e.,



9.30% by the respondents/promoters which is the same as is being granted to the complainant in case of delayed possession charges.

31. On consideration of the documents available on record and submissions made by both the parties regarding contravention of provisions of the Act, the authority is satisfied that the respondents are in contravention of the section 11(4)(a) of the Act by not handing over possession by the due date as per the agreement. By virtue of clause 11 of the agreement executed between the parties on 18.11.2015, the possession of the subject plot was to be delivered within a period of 30 months from the date of execution of this agreement which comes out to be 18.05.2018. As far as grace period is concerned, the same is disallowed for the reasons quoted above. Therefore, the due date of handing over possession is 18.05.2018. The respondent has failed to handover possession of the subject plot till date of this order. Accordingly, it is the failure of the respondent/promoter to fulfil its obligations and responsibilities as per the agreement to hand over the possession within the stipulated period. Accordingly, the 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 the



allottee shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay from due date of possession i.e., 18.05.2018 till the handing over of the possession, at prescribed rate i.e., 9.30 % p.a. as per proviso to section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules.

32. The allottee requested for fresh statement of account of the unit based on the above determinations of the authority.

H. Directions of the authority

33. 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 to pay interest at the prescribed rate of 9.30% p.a. for every month of delay from the due date of possession i.e., 18.05.2018 till the date of handing over possession.
- ii. The promoter may credit delay possession charges in the account ledger/statement of account of the unit of the allottee, if the amount outstanding against the allottee is more than the DPC this will be treated as sufficient compliance of this order.



- iii. If there is no amount outstanding against the allottee or less amount outstanding against the allottee then the balance delay possession charges shall be paid after adjustment of the outstanding against the allottee.
- iv. The arrears of such interest accrued from 18.05.2018 till the date of order by the authority shall be paid by the promoter to the allottee within a period of 90 days from date of this order and interest for every month of delay shall be paid by the promoter to the allottee before 10th of the subsequent month as per rule 16(2) of the rules.
- v. The complainants are directed to pay outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment of interest for the delayed period.
- vi. The rate of interest chargeable from the allottee by the promoter, in case of default shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 9.30% by the respondents/promoters which are 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.
- vii. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainants which is not the part of the agreement, however, holding charges shall not be charged by the

promoter at any point of time even after being part of agreement as per law settled by hon'ble Supreme Court in civil appeal no. 3864-3899/2020.

- viii. The promoter is directed to furnish to the allottee statement of account within one month of issue of this order. If there is any objection by the allottee on statement of account, the same be filed with promoters after fifteen days thereafter. In case the grievance of the allottee relating to statement of account is not settled by the promoter within 15 days thereafter then the allottee may approach the authority by filing separate application.

34. Complaint stands disposed of.

35. File be consigned to registry.


(Samir Kumar)
Member


(Vijay Kumar Goyal)
Member


(Dr. K.K. Khandelwal)
Chairman

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 24.03.2021

Judgement uploaded on 08.06.2021