



## HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: [www.haryanarera.gov.in](http://www.haryanarera.gov.in)

BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER

Complaint No. -528 of 2018

Date of Institution: -11.09.2018

Date of Decision: - 27.07.2021

Manoj Kumar s/o Sh. Sundar Lal Tiwari r/o C-696, Sarita Vihar, New Delhi-110076.  
....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

M/s B.P.T.P. Ltd, through Director/Authorized representative, M-11, Middle Circle, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-110001

....RESPONDENT

Hearing:- 34<sup>th</sup>

**Present:** Mr. Manoj Kumar, Complainant through VC  
Mr. Hemant Saini & Mr. Himanshu Monga, Counsel for respondent

### ORDER:-

The brief facts culminating into the institution of present complaint are:-

2. Complainant had booked a flat E-80-GF having area of 1186 sq ft under the construction linked plan in the respondent's project 'Park Elite Floors' situated in Faridabad in year 2015. Builder buyer agreement was executed between the parties on 09.06.2015 and in terms of it, possession of unit was supposed to be delivered up to 09.12.2018. An amount of ₹ 14,59,780/- has already been paid (last payment was made on 09.01.2016) against the basic sale

Sd/- Gupta



price of ₹ 43,64,724/- . It has been alleged by the complainant that respondent had arbitrarily charged preferential location charges whereas in terms of builder buyer agreement total amount for preferential location charges was determined as zero. It has been stated that carpet area committed in the builder buyer agreement as 1082 sq ft was drastically reduced to 902 sq ft without consent of allottee. An offer of possession dated 22.06.2018 was sent by the respondent without receiving occupation certificate. Said unit was purchased by the complainant by availing loan from the bank.

3. Feeling aggrieved, present complaint has been filed by the complainant seeking quashing of offer of possession letter dated 22.06.2018 as it was not supported with Occupation Certificate, to set aside the illegal charges of preferential location charges, to set aside the illegal charges of sewage treatment plant, to issue directions to respondent to adjust the reduced carpet area in the final demand notice, to issue directions to respondent to complete the project with all infrastructure as provided in the layout plan, to issue directions to respondent to provide the quality construction, material, fittings and fixtures as per the plan, to direct the respondent to pay sum of ₹ 3,00,000/- to complainant as compensation for unfair trade practices, to direct the respondent to pay sum of ₹ 3,00,000/- to complainant as compensation for mental harassment and anxiety, to direct the respondent to pay sum of ₹ 1,00,000/- as reimbursement of legal expenses.

directions to respondent

in the layout plan, to

ation; material, fitting

to pay sum of ₹ 3,

*Savitri Gupta*



4. Respondent had appeared and filed his reply wherein it has been submitted that unit number E-80-GF was allotted to complainant vide allotment letter dated 10.05.2015. Construction updates were duly communicated to complainant vide email dated 18.08.2017, 08.12.2017, 10.04.2018, 11.05.2018, and 17.06.2018 as complainant has bought this unit under possession linked plan. There after possession of unit after completing its construction was offered to complainant vide letter dated 22.06.2018 but it is the complainant who has not come forward to take possession of unit after paying due amount. There is no delay on part of respondent as possession was offered within timeline stipulated in builder buyer agreement. Regarding issue of decrease in area, it has been stated that unit was sold on basis of super built up area and not carpet area and fact is that area remains the same i.e. 1186 square feet which is the original allotted area as per the builder buyer agreement. Regarding charges of preferential location it has been stated that unit allotted to complainant is on sector road and accordingly 10% preferential location charges are applicable on it in terms of builder buyer agreement. Moreover, Occupation Certificate for the said unit was received on 07.09.2018 i.e just after 3 months of offer of possession. Regarding substandard of construction material, it has been submitted that the allegations of complainant are baseless because material used by the respondent are as per ISO standard. On aforesaid grounds respondent has prayed for dismissal of the complaint.

5. Record reveals that the present complaint has been filed by the complainant on 11.09.2018 seeking quashing of offer of possession letter dated 22.06.2018 as



it was not supported with Occupation Certificate, to set aside the illegal charges of preferential location , to set aside the illegal charges of STP, to issue direction to respondent to adjust the reduced carpet area in the final demand notice, to issue direction to respondent to complete the project with all infrastructure as provided in the layout plan, to issue direction to respondent to provide the quality construction, material, fittings and fixtures as per the plan, to direct the respondent to pay sum of ₹ 3,00,000/- to complainant as compensation for unfair trade practices, to direct the respondent to pay sum of ₹ 3,00,000/- to complainant as compensation for mental harassment and anxiety, to direct the respondent to pay sum of ₹ 1,00,000/- as reimbursement of legal expenses. Vide order dated 15.02.2019 passed by the then Adjudicating Officer, complainant was advised to institute a complaint for the relief of possession before the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority as jurisdiction of Adjudicating Officer is restricted only for adjudging compensation. Accordingly, complainant had instituted a Complaint no. 881 of 2019 titled as Manoj Kumar versus BPTP Pvt Ltd before Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority Panchkula on 29.03.2019 for relief of possession, delay interest, to direct the respondent for removing preferential location charges, to revise the final demand in accordance with changed layout plan and decrease in carpet area, to direct the respondent to remove electrification STP charges, to revise meter connection charges, to direct the respondent to withdraw maintenance invoice , to impose penalty upon respondent as per provision of section 60 of RERA Act,2016, to issue direction to respondent to pay



compensation to the complainant for mental agony, pain and harassment. Now present complaint is limited to compensation only.

6. Perusal of file shows that the complainant had booked flat no. E-80-GF having area of 1186 sq ft in the respondent's project 'Park Elite Floors' Faridabad under construction linked plan in year 2015. Builder buyer agreement was executed on 09.06.2015. As per terms of the said agreement, possession of the unit was to be handed over to complainant upto 09.12.2018. Basic sale price was ₹ 43,64,724/. Against the said basic sale price, amount of ₹ 14,59,780/- was paid by the complainant to the respondent. It is the allegation of the complainant that invalid offer of possession was made by the respondent on 22.06.2018, but by that time Occupation Certificate was not received by the respondent.
7. On the other hand, it is the argument of learned counsel for respondent that occupation certificate was received by developer on 07.09.2018, copy of which has been placed on record as Exhibit CW-1/5. The complainant has prayed for compensation of ₹ 3,00,000/- for unfair trade practice, ₹ 3,00,000/- for mental harassment and anxiety, ₹ 1,00,000/- as legal expenses.
8. Under the head of unfair trade practice the complainant has sought ₹ 3,00,000/- as compensation, the complainant has not stated even a single word in his complaint as to what unfair trade practice has been committed by the respondent for which complainant is to be compensated. In the absence of any such specific pleading and argument or evidence, it cannot be said that any unfair

for unfair trade pra

CC-000/4 as legal expc

5

unfair trade practice is

Sarita Gupta



trade practice has been committed by the respondent for which complainant is liable to be compensated.


9. Second head for compensation is taken as mental harassment and anxiety. Though it has been argued by learned counsel for complainant that complainant is entitled to ₹ 3,00,000/- as compensation because of mental harassment and sufferings given by the respondent. At this stage, it is worthwhile to point it out here that as per builder buyer agreement, possession of unit was to be delivered on 09.12.2018. Offer of possession has been made by the respondent on 22.06.2018. Though it is the argument of learned counsel for complainant that offer of possession was not accompanied with occupation certificate, yet the copy of occupation certificate has been placed on record showing that it was received by the respondent on 07.09.2018. It is also within the stipulated time period, for handing over of possession to complainant-allottee. The offer of possession by respondent was around six months prior to the date fixed for handing over of possession and occupation certificate was received three months prior to date fixed for handing over of possession. If handing over of possession of the unit to the complainant-allottee would have been delayed, the complainant could be said to be entitled to compensation under the head mental harassment and anxiety. If the possession has been offered much prior in time, it cannot be said that complainant has suffered any mental harassment or agony or anxiety. In the absence of any such proof, he cannot be said to be entitled to any compensation on account of mental harassment, agony and anxiety.




10. Next head taken by the complainant claiming compensation is legal expenses. Learned counsel for complainant has placed on record copy of receipt dated 19.07.2018 in the sum of ₹ 35,400/- showing that out of said amount he had paid ₹ 17,700/- to his counsel and he is liable for reimbursement of legal expenses.
11. The complainant could be said to be entitled to legal expenses only when he would have been granted compensation on any ground either unfair trade practice or mental harassment and agony. If the possession of the unit has been offered to complainant prior to the time fixed between the parties by virtue of builder buyer agreement and he is not held entitled to compensation on account of unfair trade practice or mental harassment, he cannot be said to be entitled for reimbursement of legal expenses.
12. Hence it is hereby observed that the claimant is not entitled to compensation under any head claimed by him or reimbursement of legal expenses.
13. Finding no merit, the present complaint is ordered to be **dismissed**. Order be uploaded on the website and file be consigned to record room.

27.07.2021

Note: This order contains 7 pages. All the pages have been checked and signed by me.

  
.....  
Dr. Sarita Gupta  
[Adjudicating Officer]

  
.....  
Dr. Sarita Gupta  
[Adjudicating Officer]