

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

Complaint no. : 4849 of 2020
First date of hearing : 03.03.2021
Date of decision : 12.08.2021

1. Divya Prasad Naragani
2. Deepak Singh Negi
Both RR/o: D-35, Golf View Apartments,
Saket, New Delhi- 110017.

Complainants

Versus

M/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd.
Address: Emaar Business Park,
M.G. Road, Sector 28, Sikandarpur Chowk,
Gurugram, Haryana.

Respondent

CORAM:

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

Chairman
Member
Member

APPEARANCE:

Shri Varun Chugh

Advocate for the complainants

Shri J.K. Dang along with Shri Ishaan Dang

Advocates for the respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated 13.01.2021 has been filed by the complainants/allottees in Form CRA 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 to the allottee as per the agreement for sale executed inter se them.

2. Since, the buyer's agreement has been executed on 09.02.2010 i.e. prior to the commencement of the Act *ibid*, therefore, the penal proceedings cannot be initiated retrospectively. Hence, the authority has decided to treat the present complaint as an application for non-compliance of statutory obligation on part of the promoter/respondent in terms of section 34(f) of the Act *ibid*.

A. Project and unit related details

3. 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	"Emerald Estate Apartments at Emerald Estate" in Sector 65, Gurugram, Haryana.
2.	Project area	25.499 acres
3.	Nature of the project	Group housing colony
4.	DTCP license no. and validity status	06 of 2008 dated 17.01.2008 Valid/renewed up to 16.01.2025
5.	Name of licensee	Active Promoters Pvt. Ltd. and 2 others C/o Emaar MGF Land Ltd.
6.	HRERA registered/ not registered	"Emerald Estate" registered vide no. 104 of 2017 dated 24.08.2017 for 82768 sq. mtrs.
	HRERA registration valid up to	23.08.2022

7.	Occupation certificate granted on	11.11.2020 [Page 142 of reply]
8.	Provisional allotment letter	24.09.2009 [Page 37 of reply]
9.	Unit no.	EEA-F-F02-01, 2 nd floor, building no. F [Page 16 of complaint]
10.	Unit measuring	1395 sq. ft.
11.	Date of execution of buyer's agreement	09.02.2010 [Page 14 of complaint]
12.	Payment plan	Construction linked payment plan [Page 84 of reply]
13.	Total consideration as per statement of account dated 23.02.2021 [Page 40 of reply]	Rs.56,26,756/-
14.	Total amount paid by the complainants as per statement of account dated 23.02.2021 [Page 41 of reply]	Rs.56,29,381/-
15.	Date of start of construction as per statement of account dated 23.02.2021 [Page 40 of reply]	26.08.2010
16.	Nomination letter issued in favour of the complainants	14.07.2018 [Page 47 of complaint]
17.	Due date of delivery of possession as per clause 11(a) of the said agreement i.e. 36 months from the date of commencement of construction (26.08.2010) + grace period of 6 months, for applying and obtaining completion certificate/ occupation certificate in respect of the unit and/or the project. [Page 29 of complaint]	26.08.2013 [Note: Grace period is not included]
18.	Date of offer of possession to the complainants	20.11.2020 [Page 51 of complaint]

19.	Delay in handing over possession w.e.f. 26.08.2013 (Due date of handing over possession) till 20.01.2021 i.e. date of offer of possession (20.11.2020) + 2 months	7 year 4 months 25 days
-----	---	-------------------------

B. Facts of the complaint

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

- i. That the property in question i.e. EEA-F-F02-01 (second floor) admeasuring 1395 sq. ft., in the said project was booked by the Mr. Arun Kumar Modgill (original allottee) in the year 2009. Thereafter, on 09.02.2010, original allottee entered into a buyer's agreement with the respondent, by virtue of which the respondent allotted apartment no. EEA-F-F02-01, having super area of 1395 sq. ft. located on the second floor, along-with car parking space in the said project.
- ii. That subsequent thereto, the complainants entered into agreement to sell with the original allottee with regard to the said property and the property was later assigned to the complainants by the respondent by virtue of the assignment letter/nomination letter dated 14.07.2018.
- iii. That the total cost of the apartment is Rs.56,26,756/- only and since it was a construction linked plan, hence the payment was to be made on the basis of schedule of payment provided by the respondent. The complainants had made the total payment towards the cost of the

apartment and nothing is due and payable by the complainants and the same is evident from the statement of account.

- iv. That as per clause 11(a) of the buyer's agreement dated 09.02.2010, the respondent had categorically stated that the possession of the said apartment would be handed over to the complainants within 36 months from the date of commencement of the construction and development of the unit, with a further grace period of another 6 months. But the respondent never intended to keep its promise and upon the complainant's enquiry regarding the project status via emails, the latter used to hoodwink the complainants by giving false deadlines to complete the project.
- v. That the said buyer's agreement is totally one sided, which impose completely biased terms and conditions upon the complainants, thereby tilting the balance of power in favour of the respondent, which is further manifested from the fact that the delay in handing over the possession by the respondent would attract only a meagre penalty of Rs.5/- per sq. ft. on the super area of the apartment, on monthly basis, whereas the penalty for failure to take possession would attract holding charges of Rs.50/- per sq. ft. and 24% penal interest on the unpaid amount of instalment due to the respondent.
- vi. That the complainants also visited the project site and observed that there are serious qualities issues with respect to the construction carried out by respondent. The apartments were sold by

representing that the same will be luxurious apartment however all such representations seem to have been made in order to lure complainants to purchase the floor at extremely high prices. The respondent has compromised with levels of quality and is guilty of mis-selling. There are various deviations from the initial representations. The respondent marketed luxury high end apartment, but has compromised even with the basic features, designs and quality to save costs. The structure, which has been constructed on face of it is of extremely poor quality. The construction is totally unplanned, with sub-standard, low grade, defective and despicable construction quality.

- vii. That the respondent has breached the fundamental term of the contract by inordinately delaying in delivery of the possession by 81 months. The complainants were made to make advance deposit on the basis of information contained in the brochure, which is false on the face of it as is evident from the construction done at site.
- viii. That the complainants, without any default, had been paying the instalments towards the property, as and when demanded by the respondent. The respondent had promised to complete the project by February 2014 including the grace period of six months. The buyer's agreement was executed on 09.02.2010 and the possession was finally offered on 20.11.2020 which resulted in extreme kind of mental distress, pain and agony to the complainants.

- ix. That the complainants, through various calls and personal visits, besides emails addressed to the respondent had asked to indemnify them, for the delay in handing over the possession of the apartment but the respondent company had miserably failed to accede to the genuine and legitimate request of the complainants and has turned deaf ear.
- x. The respondent had breached the fundamental term of the contract by inordinately delaying in delivery of possession and the project had been inordinately delayed. The respondent had committed gross violation of the provisions of section 18(1) of the Act by not handing over the timely possession of the flat in question and not giving interest and compensation to the buyer as per the provisions of the Act.

C. Relief sought by the complainants

5. The complainants have filed the present compliant for seeking following relief:
- i. Direct the respondent to pay interest @ 18% p.a. towards delay in handing over the property in question as per the provisions of the Act and the rules.
 - ii. Pass such other order or further order as this hon'ble authority may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

6. 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 and to plead guilty or not to plead guilty.

D. Reply by the respondent

7. The respondent has raised certain preliminary objections and has contested the present complaint on the following grounds:

- i. That the complainants have filed the present complaint seeking, inter-alia, interest and compensation for alleged delay in delivering possession of the apartment purchased by the complainants. It is respectfully submitted that complaints pertaining to refund, compensation and interest are to be decided by the adjudicating officer under section 71 of the Act read with rule 29 of the rules 2017 and not by this authority. The present complaint is liable to be dismissed on this ground alone. Moreover, the adjudicating officer derives his jurisdiction from the central statute which cannot be negated by the rules made thereunder.
- ii. That present complaint is based on an erroneous interpretation of the provisions of the Act as well as an incorrect understanding of the terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement dated 09.02.2010. The provisions of the Act are not retrospective in nature. The provisions of the Act cannot undo or modify the terms of an agreement duly executed prior to coming into effect of the Act. That

merely because the Act applies to ongoing projects which are registered with the authority, the Act cannot be said to be operating retrospectively. The provisions of the Act relied upon by the complainants for seeking interest or compensation cannot be called in to aid in derogation and in negation of the provisions of the buyer's agreement. The interest is compensatory in nature and cannot be granted in derogation and ignorance of the provisions of the buyer's agreement. The interest for the alleged delay demanded by the complainants is beyond the scope of the buyer's agreement. The complainants cannot demand any interest or compensation beyond the terms and conditions incorporated in the buyer's agreement.

- iii. That apartment bearing no. EEA-F-F02-01 was provisionally allotted to the original allottee (Mr. Arun Kumar Modgill) having tentative super area of 1395 sq. ft. vide provisional allotment letter dated 24.09.2009 in favour of the original allottee. Thereafter, the buyer's agreement executed between the original allottee and the respondent dated 09.02.2010.
- iv. That the original allottee consciously and willfully opted for a construction linked plan for remittance of the sale consideration for the unit in question and further represented to respondent that the original allottee shall remit every installment on time as per the payment schedule. The original allottee had defaulted in remittance

of installments on time. The respondent was compelled to issue demand notices, reminders etc. calling upon the original allottee to make payment of outstanding amounts payable by the original allottee under the payment plan/instalment plan opted by him. However, the original allottee despite having received the payment request letters, reminders etc. failed to remit the instalments on time to the respondent. Statement of account dated 23.02.2021 maintained by respondent in due course of its business reflects the delay in remittance of various instalments on the part of the original allottee.

- v. That thereafter the unit in question was transferred to Mr. Bhavtosh Bansal (hereinafter "Subsequent Allottee") by the original allottee. Agreement to sell dated 18.03.2010 was executed between the original allottee and the subsequent allottee. The subsequent allottee, at the time of purchasing the unit in question from the original allottee, had consciously and voluntarily declared and affirmed that he would be bound by all the terms and conditions of the provisional allotment in favour of the original allottee. Furthermore, the respondent had specifically indicated to the subsequent allottee at the time of endorsement of the unit in question in his favour that the original allottee had defaulted in timely remittance of the instalments pertaining to the unit in question and therefore, has disentitled himself for any

compensation. The subsequent allottee had accepted and acknowledged that on account of the defaults in timely remittance of the instalments by the original allottee, he would not stake any claim against the respondent on account of delay, if any, in delivery of possession of the unit in question.

- vi. That thereafter one Mrs. Anjali Bansal (hereinafter "erstwhile allottee") approached the subsequent allottee for purchasing his rights and title in the unit in question. The subsequent allottee acceded to the request of the erstwhile allottee and agreed to transfer and convey his rights, entitlement and title in the unit in question to the erstwhile allottee and executed an agreement to sell dated 21.04.2012. The respondent issued a nomination letter dated 08.05.2012 in favour of the erstwhile allottee relying upon the aforesaid assurances and promises advanced by her.
- vii. That thereafter the complainants approached the erstwhile allottee for purchasing her rights and title in the unit in question. The erstwhile allottee acceded to the request of the complainants and agreed to transfer and convey her rights, entitlement and title in the unit in question and executed an agreement to sell dated 25.06.2018 with the complainants.
- viii. That the complainants had executed an affidavit dated 26.06.2018 and an indemnity cum undertaking dated 26.06.2018 whereby the complainants had consciously and voluntarily declared and affirmed

that they would be bound by all the terms and conditions of the provisional allotment in favour of the erstwhile allottee. It was further declared by the complainants that they having been substituted in the place of the erstwhile allottee in respect of the provisional allotment of the unit in question were not entitled to any compensation for delay, if any, in delivery of possession of the unit in question or any rebate under a scheme or otherwise or any other discount, by whatever name called, from respondent. Furthermore, the respondent, at the time of endorsement of the unit in question in favour of the complainants, had specifically indicated to the complainants that the original allottee, the subsequent allottee and the erstwhile allottee have disentitled themselves for any compensation/interest. The respondent had conveyed to the complainants that on account of the defaults of the original allottee in timely remittance of the instalments as well as the promises/representations advanced by the subsequent allottee and erstwhile allottee, the complainants would not be entitled to any compensation for delay, if any. The said position was duly accepted and acknowledged by the complainants.

- ix. That clause 13 of the buyer's agreement provides that compensation for any delay in delivery of possession shall only be given to such allottees who are not in default of their obligations envisaged under the agreement and who have not defaulted in payment of

instalments as per the payment plan incorporated in the agreement. Furthermore, clause 11(b)(iv) provides that in the event of any default or delay in payment of instalments as per the schedule of payments incorporated in the buyer's agreement, the time for delivery of possession shall also stand extended. Since, the original allottee had defaulted in timely remittance of payments as per schedule of payment, the date of delivery of possession is not liable to be determined in the manner sought to be done in the present case by the complainants.

- x. That the respondent has also credited Rs.30,865/- as benefit on account of anti-profiting. Without prejudice to the rights of the respondent, delayed interest if any has to be calculated only on the amounts deposited by the allottees/complainants towards the basic principal amount of the unit in question and not on any amount credited by the respondent, or any payment made by the allottees/complainants towards delayed payment charges or any taxes/statutory payments etc.
- xi. That the respondent had submitted an application dated 21.07.2020 for issuance of occupation certificate before the concerned statutory authority. It is submitted that once an application is submitted before the statutory authority, the respondent ceases to exercise any control over the matter. The grant of occupation certificate is the prerogative of the concerned statutory authority, and the

respondent cannot exercise any influence over the same. Thus, the time period utilised by the concerned statutory authority to grant occupation certificate to respondent needs to be necessarily excluded from computation of the time period for implementation of the project.

- xii. That the project got delayed on account of various reasons which were/are beyond the power and control of the respondent and hence the respondent cannot be held responsible for the same. *Firstly*, the respondent was constrained to terminating the contract with one of the contractors of the project which has also contributed to delay in construction activities at the site. The contractor was unable to meet the agreed timelines for construction of the project. After termination of the contract, the respondent had filed petition before the Hon'ble High Court seeking interim protection against the contractor. Similar petition was also filed by the contractor against the respondent. The Hon'ble High Court appointed Justice A.P. Shah (Retd.) as sole arbitrator for adjudication of dispute between the respondent and contractor. The Hon'ble Arbitrator vide order dated 27.04.2019 gave liberty to the respondent to appoint another contractor w.e.f. 15.05.2019. The respondent had been diligently pursuing the matter with the contractor before the sole arbitrator and no fault can be attributed to the respondent in this regard and the respondent cannot be held responsible for the same. *Secondly*, in

the meanwhile, the National Building Code (NBC) was revised in the year 2016 and in terms of the same, all high-rise buildings (i.e buildings having height of 15 mtrs and above), irrespective of the area of each floor, are now required to have two staircases. Furthermore, it was notified vide Gazette published on 15.03.2017 that the provisions of NBC 2016 supersede provisions of NBC 2005. The respondent had accordingly sent representations to various authorities identifying the problems in constructing a second staircase. Eventually, so as to not cause any further delay in the project and so as to avoid jeopardising the safety of the occupants of the buildings in question, the respondent had taken a decision to go ahead and construct the second staircase. However, due to the impending BL Kashyap (contractor) issue of non-performance, the construction of the second staircase could not be started as well.

- xiii. That the occupation certificate in respect of the tower in which the unit in question is located was granted on 11.11.2020. The complainants were offered possession of the unit in question through letter of offer of possession dated 20.11.2020. The complainants were called upon to remit balance payment including delayed payment charges and to complete the necessary formalities/documentation necessary for handover of the unit in question to them. However, the complainants have consciously refrained from obtaining possession of the unit in question. The

complainants did not have adequate funds to remit the balance payments requisite for obtaining possession in terms of the buyer's agreement and thus refrained from obtaining possession of the unit in question. Therefore, there is no equity in favour of the complainants.

xiv. That the project of the respondent is an "ongoing project" under the Act and the same has been registered under the Act and the rules. Registration certificate was granted by the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority vide memo no. HRERA-482/2017/829 dated 24.08.2017. Without admitting or acknowledging in any manner the truth or legality of the allegations levelled by the complainants and without prejudice to the contentions of the respondent, it is respectfully submitted that the complaint preferred by the complainants is devoid of any cause of action. It is submitted that the registration of the project is valid till 23.08.2022 and therefore cause of action, if any, would accrue in favour of the complainants to prefer a complaint if the respondent fails to deliver possession of the unit in question within the aforesaid period.

xv. That several allottees have defaulted in timely remittance of payment of installments which was an essential, crucial and an indispensable requirement for conceptualisation and development of the project in question. Furthermore, when the proposed allottees default in their payments as per schedule agreed upon, the failure

has a cascading effect on the operations and the cost for proper execution of the project increases exponentially whereas enormous business losses befall upon the respondent. The respondent, despite default of several allottees, has diligently and earnestly pursued the development of the project in question and has constructed the project in question as expeditiously as possible. It is submitted that the construction of the tower in which the unit in question is situated has been completed by the respondent. The respondent has already delivered possession of the unit in question to the complainants. Therefore, there is no default or lapse on the part of the respondent and there is no equity in favour of the complainants. Thus, it is most respectfully submitted that the present complaint deserves to be dismissed at the very threshold.

8. 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.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

9. The preliminary objections raised by the respondent regarding jurisdiction of the authority to entertain the present complaint stands rejected. The authority observed 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, 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

11. The authority has complete jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the promoter as per provisions of section 11(4)(a) of the Act 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 jurisdiction of authority w.r.t. buyer's agreement executed prior to coming into force of the Act

12. One of the contentions of the respondent is 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 buyer's 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 respondent further submitted that the provisions of the Act are not retrospective in nature and the provisions of the Act cannot undo or

modify the terms of buyer's agreement duly executed prior to coming into effect of the Act. 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 hon'ble Bombay High Court in ***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."

13. Also, in appeal no. 173 of 2019 titled as ***Magic Eye Developer Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Ishwer Singh Dahiya*** 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."

14. 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 buyer's 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 the Act and are not unreasonable or exorbitant in nature.

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 there is no default on the part of the respondent as the respondent has offered possession of the subject unit within the period of validity of registration of the project under the Act i.e. before 23.08.2022. 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: —.....

(I): -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 apartment 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 apartment buyer agreement. The new timeline as indicated by the promoter in the declaration under section 4(2)(l)(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 apartment 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 exclusion of time taken by the competent authority in processing the application and issuance of occupation certificate

19. As far as contention of the respondent with respect to the exclusion of time taken by the competent authority in processing the application and issuance of occupation certificate is concerned, the authority observed that the respondent had applied for grant of occupation certificate on 21.07.2020 and thereafter vide memo no. ZP-441-Vol.II/AD(RA)/2020/20094 dated 11.11.2020, the occupation certificate has been granted by the competent authority under the prevailing law. The authority cannot be a silent spectator to the deficiency in the application submitted by the promoter for issuance of occupancy certificate. It is evident from the occupation certificate dated 11.11.2020 that an incomplete application for grant of OC was applied on 21.07.2020 as fire NOC from the competent authority was granted only on 25.09.2020 which is subsequent to the filing of application for occupation certificate. Also, the Chief Engineer-I, HSVP, Panchkula has submitted his requisite report in respect of the said project on 24.09.2020 & 22.09.2020. The District Town Planner, Gurugram and Senior Town Planner, Gurugram has submitted requisite report about this project on 21.09.2020 and 23.09.2020 respectively. As such, the application submitted on 21.07.2020 was incomplete and an incomplete application is no application in the eyes of law.

20. The application for issuance of occupancy certificate shall be moved in the prescribed forms and accompanied by the documents mentioned in sub-code 4.10.1 of the Haryana Building Code, 2017. As per sub-code 4.10.4 of the said Code, after receipt of application for grant of occupation certificate, the competent authority shall communicate in writing within 60 days, its decision for grant/ refusal of such permission for occupation of the building in Form BR-VII. In the present case, the respondent has completed its application for occupation certificate only on 25.09.2020 and consequently the concerned authority has granted occupation certificate on 11.11.2020. Therefore, in view of the deficiency in the said application dated 21.07.2020 and aforesaid reasons, no delay in granting occupation certificate can be attributed to the concerned statutory authority.

F.IV Whether a subsequent allottee who had executed an indemnity cum undertaking with waiver clause is entitled to claim delay possession charges?

21. The respondent submitted that complainants in question are subsequent allottees and complainants have executed an affidavit dated 26.06.2018 and an indemnity cum undertaking dated 26.06.2018 whereby the complainants have consciously and voluntarily declared and affirmed that they would be bound by all the terms and conditions of the provisional allotment in favour of the original allottee. It was further declared by the complainants that they, having been substituted in the place of the original allottee in respect of the provisional allotment of the

unit in question, was not entitled to any compensation for delay. Therefore, the complainants are not entitled to any compensation. With regard to the above contentions raised by the promoter/developer, it is worthwhile to examine following four sub-issues:

- (i) Whether subsequent allottee is also allottee as per provisions of the Act?
- (ii) Whether the subsequent allottee is entitled to delayed possession charges w.e.f. due date of handing over possession or w.e.f. the date of nomination letter/endorsement (i.e. date on which he became allottee)?
- (iii) Whether delay possession charges are in the nature of statutory legal obligation of the promoter other than compensation?
- (iv) Whether indemnity-cum-undertaking with waiver clause at the time of transfer of unit is arbitrary and whether statutory rights can be waived of by such one sided and unreasonable undertaking?

i. Whether subsequent allottee is also an allottee as per provisions of the Act?

22. The term "allottee" as defined in the Act also includes and means the subsequent allottee, hence is entitled to the same relief as that of the original allottee. The definition of the allottee as provided in the Act is reproduced as under:

"2 In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires-

- (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**".

23. Accordingly, following are allottees as per this definition:

- (a) **Original allottee:** A 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.
- (b) **Allottees after subsequent transfer from the original allottee:** A person who acquires the said allotment through sale, transfer or otherwise. However, an allottee would not be a person to whom any plot, apartment or building is given on rent.

24. From a bare perusal of the definition, it is clear that the transferee of an apartment, plot or building who acquires it by any mode is an allottee. This may include (i) allotment; (ii) sale; (iii) transfer; (iv) as consideration of services; (v) by exchange of development rights; or (vi) by any other similar means. It can be safely reached to the only logical conclusion that no difference has been made between the original allottee and the subsequent allottee and once the unit, plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, has been re-allotted in the name of the subsequent purchaser by the promoter, the subsequent allottee enters into the shoes of the original allottee for all intents and purposes and he shall be bound by all the terms and conditions contained in the buyer's agreement including the rights and liabilities of the original allottee. Thus, as soon as the unit is re-allotted in his name, he will become the allottee and nomenclature "subsequent allottee" shall only remain for identification for use by the promoter. Therefore, the authority does not draw any difference between the allottee and subsequent allottee per se.

25. Reliance is placed on the judgment dated 26.11.2019 passed in consumer complaint no. 3775 of 2017 titled as **Rajnish Bhardwaj Vs. M/s CHD Developers Ltd.** by NCDRC wherein it was held as under:

"15. So far as the issue raised by the Opposite Party that the Complainants are not the original allottees of the flat and resale of flat does not come within the purview of this Act, is concerned, in our view, having issued the Re-allotment letters on transfer of the allotted Unit and endorsing the Apartment Buyers Agreement in favour of the Complainants, this plea does not hold any water....."

26. The authority concurs with the Hon'ble NCDRC's decision dated 26.11.2019 in **Rajnish Bhardwaj vs. M/s CHD Developers Ltd.** (supra) and observes that it is irrespective of the status of the allottee whether it is original or subsequent, an amount has been paid towards the consideration for a unit and the endorsement by the developer on the transfer documents clearly implies his acceptance of the complainant as an allottee.
27. Therefore, taking the above facts into account, the authority is of the view that the term subsequent allottee has been used synonymously with the term allottee in the Act. The subsequent allottee at the time of buying the said unit takes on the rights as well as obligations of the original allottee vis-a-viz the same terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement entered into by the original allottee. Moreover, the amount if any paid by the subsequent or original allottee is adjusted against the unit in question and not against any individual. Furthermore, the name of the complainants/subsequent allottees have been endorsed on the same

builder buyer's agreement which was executed between the original allottee and the promoter. Therefore, the rights and obligation of the subsequent allottees and the promoter will also be governed by the said buyer's agreement.

ii. **Whether the subsequent allottees are entitled to delayed possession charges w.e.f. due date of handing over possession or w.e.f. the date of nomination letter (i.e. date on which they became allottee)?**

28. The respondent/promoter contended that the complainants/subsequent allottees shall not be entitled to any compensation/delayed possession charges since at the time of the execution of transfer documents/agreement for sale, they were well aware of the due date of possession and have knowingly waived off their right to claim any compensation for delay in handing over possession or any rebate under a scheme or otherwise or any other discount. The respondent/ promoter had spoken about the disentanglement of compensation/delayed possession charges to the complainants/subsequent allottees who had clear knowledge of the fact w.r.t. the due date of possession and whether the project was already delayed. But despite that they entered into the agreement for sell and/or indemnity-cum-undertaking knowingly waiving off their right of compensation.

29. Furthermore, the respondent contended that the previous allottee had transferred the unit in favour of complainants/subsequent allottees after the Act came into force and where the project has been registered under the Act by the respondent. It was argued by the promoter that in cases

where the subsequent allottee came into picture after the registration of the project under the provisions of the Act with the authority, then the date of completion of the project and handing over the possession shall be the date declared by the promoter under section 4(2)(l)(C) of the Act. The counsel of the respondent further argued that the while purchasing the unit, it is presumed that the allottee very well knew that the project would be completed by that specific declared date, therefore, the delayed possession charges shall not be allowed.

30. The authority is of the view that the time period for handing over the possession is committed by the builder as per the relevant clause of builder buyer's 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 builder buyer's agreement. The new timeline as indicated by the promoter in the declaration under section 4(2)(l)(C) is now the new timeline as indicated by him for the completion of the project. Although, penal proceedings cannot 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 for possession as per the agreement remains unchanged and the 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 builder buyer's agreement and is liable for the delayed possession charges as provided in proviso to section 18(1) of the Act. 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. The same issue has been dealt by Hon'ble Bombay High Court in case titled as **Neelkamal Realtors Suburban Pvt. Ltd.** (supra) wherein it was held that the RERA Act does not contemplate rewriting of contract between the allottee and the promoter. The relevant para of the judgement is reproduced below:

"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..."

31. Moreover, as delineated hereinabove, the Act does not distinguish between the original allottee and the subsequent allottee. The Act, by virtue of section 18, has created statutory right of delay possession charges in favour of the allottees. No doubt, the complainants/subsequent allottees knew the new date of completion as declared by the promoter but that does not abrogate the statutory rights of the subsequent allottees.

32. In the case in hand also, though the builder buyer's agreement dated 09.02.2010 was executed prior to the Act coming into force but the endorsement was made in favour of the complainants/subsequent allottees on 14.07.2018 when the Act became applicable. The complainants/subsequent allottees at the time of buying a unit takes on the rights as well as obligations of the original allottee vis-a-viz the same terms and conditions of the builder buyer's agreement entered into by the original allottee. Although at the time of endorsement of their name in the builder buyer's agreement, the due date of possession had already lapsed but the subsequent allottees as well as the promoter had the knowledge of the statutory right of delay possession charges being accrued in his favour after coming into force of the Act. Thus, the concept of quasi-retroactivity will make the provisions of the Act and the rules applicable to the subsequent allottees. Moreover, the authority cannot ignore the settled principle of law that the waiver of statutory rights is subject to the public policy and interest vested in the right sought to be waived as reiterated by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Waman Shrinivas Kini Vs. Ratilal Bhagwandas and Co.** (AIR 1959 SC 689). In the present situation, there is nothing which can prove that such right was waived off by the complainants/subsequent allottees for either of the two reasons quoted above. In simple words, neither they have got any private benefit by waiving of their right nor does it involve any element of public interest. Therefore, the authority is of the view that in cases

where the subsequent allottee had stepped into the shoes of original allottee after coming into force of the Act and after the registration of the project in question, the delayed possession charges shall be granted w.e.f. due date of handing over possession as per the builder buyer's agreement.

iii. Whether delay possession charges are in the nature of statutory legal obligation of the promoter other than compensation?

33. It is important to understand that the Act has clearly provided interest and compensation as separate entitlement/right which the allottee can claim. An allottee is entitled to claim compensation under sections 12, 14, 18 and section 19, to be decided by the adjudicating officer as per section 71 and the quantum of compensation shall be adjudged by the adjudicating officer having due regard to the factors mentioned in section 72. The interest is payable to the allottee by the promoter in case where there is refund or payment of delay possession charges i.e., interest at the prescribed rate for every month of delay. The interest to be paid to the allottee is fixed and as prescribed in the rules which an allottee is legally entitled to get and the promoter is obligated to pay. The compensation is to be adjudged by the adjudicating officer and may be expressed either lump sum or as interest on the deposited amount after adjudgment of compensation. This compensation expressed as interest needs to be distinguished with the interest at the prescribed rate payable by the promoter to the allottee in case of delay in handing over of possession or

interest at the prescribed rate payable by the allottee to the promoter in case of default in due payments. Here, the interest is pre-determined, and no adjudication is involved. Accordingly, the distinction has to be made between the interest payable at the prescribed rate under section 18 or 19 and adjudgment of compensation under sections 12, 14, 18 and section 19. The compensation shall mean an amount paid to the flat purchasers who have suffered agony and harassment, as a result of the default of the developer including but not limited to delay in handing over of the possession.

34. In addition, the quantum of compensation to be awarded shall be subject to the extent of loss and injury suffered by the negligence of the opposite party and is not a definitive term. It may be in the form of interest or punitive in nature. However, the Act clearly differentiates between the interest payable for delayed possession charges and compensation. Section 18 of the Act provides for two separate remedies which are as under:

- i. In the event, the allottee wishes to withdraw from the project, he/she shall be entitled without prejudice to any other remedy refund of the amount paid along with interest at such rate as may be prescribed in this behalf **including compensation** in the manner as provided under this Act;
- ii. In the event, the allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, he/she 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.

35. The rate of interest in both the scenarios is fixed as per rule 15 of the rules which shall be the State Bank of India's highest marginal cost of lending rate +2%. However, for adjudging compensation or interest under sections 12,14,18 and section 19, the adjudicating officer has to take into account the various factors as provided under section 72 of the Act.

iv. **Whether indemnity-cum-undertaking with waiver clause at the time of transfer of unit is arbitrary and whether statutory rights can be waived of by such one sided and unreasonable undertaking?**

36. The authority further is unable to gather any reason or has not been exposed to any reasonable justification as to why a need arose for the complainants to sign any such affidavit or indemnity-cum-undertaking and as to why the complainants had agreed to surrender their legal rights which were available or had accrued in favour of the original allottee. Thus, no sane person would ever execute such an affidavit or indemnity-cum-undertaking unless and until some arduous and/or compelling conditions are put before him with a condition that unless and until, these arduous and/or compelling conditions are performed by him, he will not be given any relief and he is thus left with no other option but to obey these conditions. Exactly same situation has been demonstratively happened here, when the complainants/subsequent-allottees have been asked to give the affidavit or indemnity-cum-undertaking in question before transferring the unit in their name otherwise such transfer may

not be allowed by the promoter. Such an undertaking/ indemnity bond given by a person thereby giving up their valuable rights must be shown to have been executed in a free atmosphere and should not give rise to any suspicion. No reliance can be placed on any such affidavit/ indemnity-cum-undertaking and the same is liable to be discarded and ignored in its totality. Therefore, this authority does not place reliance on the said affidavit/indemnity cum undertaking. To fortify this view, we place reliance on the order dated 03.01.2020 passed by hon'ble NCDRC in case titled as **Capital Greens Flat Buyer Association and Ors. Vs. DLF Universal Ltd., Consumer case no. 351 of 2015**, wherein it was held that the execution of indemnity-cum-undertaking would defeat the provisions of section 23 and 28 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 and therefore, would be against public policy, besides being an unfair trade practice. The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein below:

"Indemnity-cum-undertaking

30. *The developer, while offering possession of the allotted flats insisted upon execution of the indemnity-cum-undertaking before it would give possession of the allotted flats to the concerned allottee.*

Clause 13 of the said indemnity-cum-undertaking required the allottee to confirm and acknowledge that by accepting the offer of possession, he would have no further demands/claims against the company of any nature, whatsoever. It is an admitted position that the execution of the undertaking in the format prescribed by the developer was a prerequisite condition, for the delivery of the possession. The opposite party, in my opinion, could not have insisted upon clause 13 of the Indemnity-cum-undertaking. The obvious purpose behind such an undertaking was to deter the allottee from making any claim against the developer, including the claim on account of the delay in delivery of

possession and the claim on account of any latent defect which the allottee may find in the apartment. The execution of such an undertaking would defeat the provisions of Section 23 and 28 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 and therefore would be against public policy, besides being an unfair trade practice. Any delay solely on account of the allottee not executing such an undertaking would be attributable to the developer and would entitle the allottee to compensation for the period the possession is delayed solely on account of his having not executed the said undertaking-cum-indemnity."

37. The said judgment of NCDRC was also upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its judgement dated 14.12.2020 passed in civil appeal nos. 3864-3889 of 2020 against the order of NCDRC.
38. Hon'ble Supreme Court and various High Courts in a plethora of judgments have held that the terms of a contract shall not be binding if it is shown that the same were one sided and unfair and the person signing did not have any other option but to sign the same. Reference can also be placed on the directions rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in civil appeal no. 12238 of 2018 titled as **Pioneer Urban Land and Infrastructure Limited Vs. Govindan Raghavan** (decided on 02.04.2019) as well as by the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in the **Neelkamal Realtors Suburban Pvt. Ltd.** (supra). A similar view has also been taken by the Apex court in **IREO Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Abhishek Khanna & Ors.** in civil appeal no. 5785 of 2019 and the same is reproduced as under:

".....that the incorporation of such one-sided and unreasonable clauses in the Apartment Buyer's Agreement constitutes an unfair trade practice under Section 2(1)(r) of the Consumer Protection Act. Even under the 1986 Act, the powers of the consumer fora were in no manner constrained to declare a contractual term as unfair or one-sided as an incident of the power to discontinue unfair or restrictive trade practices. An "unfair contract" has

been defined under the 2019 Act, and powers have been conferred on the State Consumer Fora and the National Commission to declare contractual terms which are unfair, as null and void. This is a statutory recognition of a power which was implicit under the 1986 Act.

In view of the above, we hold that the Developer cannot compel the apartment buyers to be bound by the one-sided contractual terms contained in the Apartment Buyer's Agreement."

39. The same analogy can easily be applied in the case of execution of an affidavit or indemnity-cum-undertaking which got executed from the subsequent-allottees before getting the unit transferred in their name in the record of the promoter as an allottee in place of the original allottee.
40. The authority may deal with this point from yet another aspect. By executing an affidavit/undertaking, the complainants/subsequent allottees cuts their hands from claiming delay possession charges in case of delay in giving possession of the unit beyond the stipulated time or the due date of possession. But the question which arises before the authority is that what does complainants get in return from the promoter by giving such a mischievous and unprecedented undertaking. However, the answer would be "nothing". If it is so, then why did the complainants executed such an affidavit/undertaking is beyond the comprehension and understanding of this authority.
41. The authority holds that irrespective of the execution of the affidavit/undertaking by the complainants/subsequent allottees at the time of transfer of their name as an allottee in place of the original allottee in the record of the promoter does not disentitle them from claiming the delay possession charges in case there occurs any delay in delivering the

possession of the unit beyond the due date of delivery of possession as promised even after executing an indemnity-cum-undertaking.

G. Findings on the reliefs sought by the complainants

G.1 Delay possession charges

42. In the present complaint, the complainants intend 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."

43. Clause 11(a) of the buyer's agreement provides for time period for handing over of possession and is reproduced below:

"11. POSSESSION

(a) Time of handing over the Possession

Subject to terms of this clause and subject to the Allottee(s) having complied with all the terms and conditions of this Buyer's Agreement, and not being in default under any of the provisions of this Buyer's Agreement and compliance with all provisions, formalities, documentation etc., as prescribed by the Company, the Company proposes to hand over the possession of the Unit within 36 months from the date of commencement of construction and development of the Unit. The Allottee(s) agrees and understands that the Company shall be entitled to a grace period of six months, for applying and obtaining the completion certificate/occupation certificate in respect of the Unit and/or the Project."

44. At the outset, it is relevant to comment on the preset possession clause of the agreement wherein the possession has been subjected to all kinds of terms and conditions of this agreement, and the complainants not being in default under any provisions of this agreement and compliance with all provisions, formalities and documentation as prescribed by the promoter. 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 fulfilling formalities and documentations etc. as prescribed by the promoter may make the possession clause irrelevant for the purpose of allottee and the commitment time period for handing over possession loses its meaning. The incorporation of such clause in the 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.
45. **Admissibility of grace period:** The promoter has proposed to hand over the possession of the said unit within 36 (thirty-six) months from the date of commencement of construction and further provided in agreement that promoter shall be entitled to a grace period of 6 months for applying and obtaining completion certificate/occupation certificate in respect of

said unit. The date of start of construction is 26.08.2010 as per statement of account dated 23.02.2021. The period of 36 months expired on 26.08.2013. As a matter of fact, the promoter has not applied to the concerned authority for obtaining completion certificate/ occupation certificate within the grace period prescribed by the promoter in the buyer's agreement. As per the settled law one cannot be allowed to take advantage of his own wrong. Accordingly, this grace period of 6 months cannot be allowed to the promoter at this stage.

46. **Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** The complainants are seeking delay possession charges at the rate of 18%. However, proviso to section 18 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.

47. The legislature in its wisdom in the subordinate legislation under the 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.

48. Taking the case from another angle, the complainants-allottees were entitled to the delayed possession charges/interest only at the rate of Rs.5/- per sq. ft. per month as per clause 13(a) of the buyer's agreement for the period of such delay; whereas, as per clause 1.2(c) of the buyer's agreement, the promoter was entitled to interest @ 24% per annum at the time of every succeeding instalment for the delayed payments. The functions of the authority 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 authority 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 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.

49. 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., 12.08.2021 is 7.30%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 9.30%.

50. 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;"*

51. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainants shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 9.30% by the respondent/promoter which is the same as is being granted to the complainants in case of delayed possession charges.

52. On consideration of the documents available on record and submissions made by the parties regarding contravention as per provisions of the Act, 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. By virtue of clause 11(a) of the buyer's agreement executed between the parties on 09.02.2010, possession of the said unit was to be delivered within a period of 36 months from the date of commencement of construction i.e. 26.08.2010. As far as grace period is concerned, the same is disallowed for the reasons quoted above. Therefore, the due date of handing over possession comes out to be 26.08.2013. In the present case, the complainants are subsequent allottees and had been acknowledged by the respondent vide nomination letter dated 14.07.2018 i.e. after coming into force of the Act. The complainants were offered possession by the respondent on 20.11.2020. The authority is of the considered view that there is delay on the part of the respondent to offer physical possession of the allotted unit to the complainants as per the terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement dated 09.02.2010 executed between the parties.
53. Section 19(10) of the Act obligates the allottee to take possession of the subject unit within 2 months from the date of receipt of occupation certificate. In the present complaint, the occupation certificate was granted by the competent authority on 11.11.2020. However, the respondent offered the possession of the unit in question to the

complainants only on 20.11.2020. So, it can be said that the complainants came to know about the occupation certificate only upon the date of offer of possession. Therefore, in the interest of natural justice, the complainants should be given 2 months' time from the date of offer of possession. These 2 months' of reasonable time is being given to the complainants keeping in mind that even after intimation of possession practically they have to arrange a lot of logistics and requisite documents including but not limited to inspection of the completely finished unit but this is subject to that the unit being handed over at the time of taking possession is in habitable condition. It is further clarified that the delay possession charges shall be payable to the complainants by the respondent from the due date of possession i.e. 26.08.2013 till the expiry of 2 months from the date of offer of possession (20.11.2020) which comes out to be 20.01.2021.

54. 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 complainants are entitled to delay possession charges at prescribed rate of the interest @ 9.30 % p.a. w.e.f. 26.08.2013 till 20.01.2021 as per provisions of section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules.

H. Directions of the authority


55. 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 the interest at the prescribed rate i.e. 9.30 % per annum for every month of delay on the amount paid by the complainants from due date of possession i.e. 26.08.2013 till 20.01.2021 i.e. expiry of 2 months from the date of offer of possession (20.11.2020). The arrears of interest accrued so far shall be paid to the complainants within 90 days from the date of this order as per rule 16(2) of the rules.
- ii. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainants which is not the part of the buyer's agreement. The respondent is also not entitled to claim holding charges from the complainants 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 decided on 14.12.2020.

56. Complaint stands disposed of.

57. File be consigned to registry.


(Vijay Kumar Goyal)
Member


(Samir Kumar)
Member


(Dr. K.K. Khandelwal)
Chairman

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 12.08.2021

Judgement uploaded on 26.10.2021.