

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

Complaint no. : 2302 of 2021
First date of hearing: 20.07.2021
Date of decision : 20.07.2021

Hemant Rehani

R/o: C-712, 7th Floor, Milloni CHS Ltd., Plot no.
109, Sector-2, Seawood Nerul(E), Navi Mumbai,
Maharashtra-400706

Complainant

Versus

Athena Infrastructure limited

Regd. office: M-62 & 63, 1st floor, Connaught
Place, New Delhi-110001 सत्यमेव जयते

Respondent

CORAM:

Shri Samir Kumar
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal

Member
Member

APPEARANCE:

Smt. Medhya Ahluwalia
Shri. Rahul Yadav

Advocate for the complainant
Advocate for the respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated 10.06.2021 has been filed by the complainant/allottee 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.

A. Unit and Project related details:

2. The particulars of the project, the details of sale consideration, the amount paid by the complainant, date of proposed handing over the possession, delay period, if any, have been detailed in the following tabular form:

S. No.	Heads	Information
1.	Name and location of the project	"Indiabulls Enigma" Sector 110, Gurugram
2.	Nature of the project	Residential complex
3.	Project area	15.6 acres
4.	DTCP License	213 of 2007 dated 05.09.2007 valid till 04.09.2024 10 of 2011 dated 29.01.2011 valid till 28.01.2023
	Name of the licensee	M/s Athena Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.
		64 of 2012 dated 20.06.2012 valid till 19.06.2023
	Name of the licensee	Varali properties
5.	HRERA registered/ not registered	Registered vide no. i. 351 of 2017 dated 20.11.2017 valid till 31.08.2018 ii. 354 of 2017 dated 17.11.2017 valid till 30.09.2018

		iii. 353 of 2017 dated 20.11.2017 valid till 31.03.2018 iv. 346 of 2017 dated 08.11.2017 valid till 31.08.2018
6.	Date of execution of flat buyer's agreement	24.10.2011 (As per page 53 of the complaint)
7.	Unit no.	F-001, Ground Floor, Tower/Block F (As on page 57 of the complaint)
8.	Super Area	3880 sq. ft.
9.	Payment plan	Construction linked payment plan (As per page 70 of the complaint)
10.	Total consideration	Rs. 2,37,78,600/- (As per customer ledger dated 06.01.2021 on page 97 of complaint)
11.	Total amount paid by the complainant	Rs. 2,53,31,350/- (As per customer ledger dated 06.01.2021 on page 98 of complaint)
12.	Due date of delivery of possession (As per clause 21 of the agreement: The Developer shall endeavour to complete the construction of the said building /Unit within a period of three years, with a six months grace period thereon from the date of execution of the Flat Buyers Agreement subject to timely payment by the Buyer(s) of Total Sale Price payable according to the Payment Plan applicable to him or as	24.04.2015 (Grace period of 6 months is allowed)

	<i>demanded by the Developer. The Developer on completion of the construction /development shall issue final call notice to the Buyer, who shall within 60 days thereof, remit all dues and take possession of the Unit)</i>	
13.	Offer of possession	17.04.2018 (As per page 33-34 of the reply)
14.	Offer of possession (subsequent issued letter as per request of complainant after endorsement of subject unit.) (As per page 23-24 of reply)	06.01.2021 (As per page 99 of the complaint)
15.	Occupation Certificate	06.04.2018
16.	Delay in delivery of possession till the date of offer of possession (17.04.2018) + 2 months i.e. 17.06.2018.	3 years 1 months 24 days

B. Facts of the complaint

- That sometime in November 2010, the complainant and his wife were desirous of purchasing a five Bedroom Hall Kitchen property along with parking spaces in a gated society in Gurugram and were heavily influenced by the brochure issued and circulated by the respondent in the market. The complainant and his wife approached the respondent to explore the units in the housing project namely "Indiabulls Enigma" (hereinafter referred to as the "Project") at Sector 110, Gurgaon in Pawala Khusrupur Village, Gurgaon Tehsil, Gurgaon.

4. That the respondent painted an extremely rosy picture of the subject housing project, stating that the project shall be a state of art premier project and would be one of its kinds with multi-storeyed buildings, individual flats and facilities/ amenities. It was represented by the respondent that all necessary sanctions and approvals had been obtained to complete the project and the said project will be developed and possession will be handed over within the promised timeframe. The officials of the respondent represented to the buyers that Indiabulls is developing the above project through its 100% subsidiary M/s. Athena Infrastructure Ltd. It was stated that the Indiabulls Enigma is a premium high-end multi-storey project being developed with the assistance of internationally renowned architects.
5. That after various negotiations and believing upon the false representations made by the representatives of the respondent, the complainant and his wife shortlisted a 5BHK unit admeasuring super area 3880 sq. ft. (or 360.46-sq. mtr.) along with 3 parking spaces.
6. That the complainant and his wife, after the negotiations for a flat suited to their taste and budget, applied for the flat and paid an amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- towards booking unit charges.

7. That based upon the representations of the respondent, the complainant were induced to sign a pre-printed flat buyer's agreement dated 24.10.2011 by virtue of which the complainant and his wife were allotted flat bearing unit no. 001 on ground floor in Tower No. F. admeasuring super area of 3880 sq. ft. (or 360.46 sq. mtrs.). The complainant and his wife have opted for construction linked plan.
8. That the respondent/promoter also issued an allotment letter dated 13.07.2012 in favour of the complainant and his wife. Further, on 16.10.2020, Mrs. Shubha Rehani, wife of complainant applied for the deletion of her name as co-allottee for the flat in question and assign complete rights and liabilities in favour of complainant. Further, the respondent issued a letter dated 26.10.2020 to the complainant whereby it was informed by the respondent that the deletion of the name of the second applicant from the provisional booking towards the unit in question has been completed.
9. That the complainant made timely payments, as and when demands were raised by the respondent. The payments made by the complainant have been unequivocally acknowledged, accepted, used and utilized by the respondent.

10. That the respondent had promised to complete the project within a period of 36 months from the date of execution of the builder buyer agreement with a further grace period of six months. the flat buyer's agreement was executed on 24.10.2011. The time period promised in the flat buyer's agreement to handover the flat in question is 24.04.2015, but the respondent has failed to complete the project in the said timeframe, resulting in extreme kind of mental distress, pain and agony to the complainant.
11. That the complainant till date have paid a total sum of Rs. 2,53,31,350/- against the total sale consideration. It is pertinent to mention here that at no point of time any default in payment was made by the complainant. The complainant till date has made a payment of more than 100% of the total sale consideration.
12. That the intention of the respondent was dishonest right from the beginning and that is why, it drafted unilateral terms and conditions of the flat buyer's agreement dated 24.10.2011. The said terms and conditions are entirely unfair, unjust, unconscionable, oppressive and one sided. Moreover, a perusal of the terms and conditions makes it abundantly clear that they are, in fact, a reflection of the wide disparity between the bargaining power and status of the parties involved.

13. That the bare reading of the clauses in the flat buyer's agreement show the unfairness and arbitrariness of the terms imposed upon the buyers. The respondent exercised arbitrary power and highhanded and unfair altitude is apparent on face of record, thereby imposing all liabilities on homebuyers/complainant and conveniently relieving itself from the obligations on its part.
14. That on 06.01.2021, after an inordinate delay of more than 5 years, the respondent offered the possession of the flat in question to the complainant. It is pertinent to mention here that considering the current situation of Covid-19, the complainant requested the respondent to extend the time period for the purpose of possession and other formalities, which was duly accepted by the respondent and has extended the time period for possession and other formalities till 14.07.2021, without any penalty.
15. That the project Indiabulls Enigma comprises of Towers A to J. The towers, i.e. A to C and E to J are being developed by subsidiary of Indiabulls namely Athena Infrastructure Ltd. It was presented to the complainant that Towers A to D will have 17 floors. However, during the construction the respondent and another subsidiary of Indiabulls namely M/s. Varali Properties Ltd. changed the original plan and revised the same to the detriment of the complainant and unilaterally increased 4 floors in Towers A to D. The increase in

floors/increase in FAR changed the entire theme of the project. It shall ultimately disturb the density of the colony and its basic design attraction and it will create an extra burden on the common amenities and facilities.

16. That the respondent increased the saleable area much more than was originally represented by them, which will lead to a strain on the common facilities like open areas, car parking space, club facilities, swimming pool usage, as with an increase in population density, the ease of the use of common facilities is seriously compromised against the interest of the complainant. Moreover, the strength of the structure of Tower A to D has been compromised and the foundation designed and built for 17 floors would not withstand the additional load of 4 floors. The respondent did not seek the consent of the complainant for increasing the floors and increased the floors in a secretive manner.
17. That the unlawful act of increasing the flat buyer's agreement, the respondent referred to an obscure notice released by the respondent in non-descript newspaper(s) advertising the said change in plan. This unconscionable act is clear violation of the legal mandate whereby the developer is required to invite objections from allottees before seeking any revision in the original building plans. In this regard, it is pertinent to note that the respondent have

the complete contact details including phone numbers and email ID of the complainant where it has been doing regular communication, yet the respondent never communicated any intention or actions to revise the sanctioned building plans. It is worthwhile to mention that the respondent has been sending various communications and demands, vide emails, but the respondent conveniently avoided taking approval of the complainant for the major changes in sanction plans, which has changed the fundamental nature of the project.

18. That the complainant has made visits at the site and observed that there are serious quality issues with respect to the construction carried out by respondent till now. The flats were sold by representing that the same will be luxurious apartment however, all such representations seem to have been made in order to lure complainant to purchase the flats at extremely high prices. The respondent has compromised with levels of quality and are guilty of mis-selling. There are various deviations from the initial representations. The respondent marketed luxury high end apartments, but they have 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.

19. That the respondent has sold the project stating that it will be next landmark in luxury housing and will redefine the meaning of luxury, but the respondent has converted the project into a concrete jungle and there are no visible signs of alleged luxuries.
20. That the respondent has breached the fundamental term of the contract by inordinately delaying in delivery of the possession. The agreement was executed on 24.10.2011 the project was to be completed in 3 years with grace period of six months. The respondent has committed various acts of omission and commission by making incorrect and false statement in the advertisement material as well as by committing other serious acts as mentioned in preceding paragraph. The project has been inordinately delayed for around 5 years.

C. Relief sought by the complainant:

21. The complainant has sought following relief
 - i. Direct the respondent to award delay interest @18% p.a. for every month of delay, from the date of payment till handover of possession of the flat, complete in all aspects.
22. 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:

23. That the present complaint is devoid of any merits and has been preferred with the sole motive to harass the respondent and is liable to be dismissed on the ground that the said claim of the complainant is unjustified, misconceived and without any basis as against the respondent.
24. That the alleged flat buyer's agreement dated 24.10.2011 executed between the complainant and his wife Mrs. Shubha Rehani and the respondent was prior to the enactment of the Act of 2016 and the provisions laid down in the said Act, as such same cannot be applied retrospectively. Moreover, the agreement was executed 10 years back. Therefore, any allegation in relation thereto is also barred by limitation.
25. That the present complaint filed by the complainant is outside the preview of this authority as the complainant looking into the financial viability of the Project and its future monetary benefits voluntarily approached the respondent and showed interest to book a unit in the Tower to be developed by the respondent. Thereafter the complainant after fully satisfying with the facts and conditions of the licenses, zoning plans and approved building

plans willingly signed the application form and executed a flat buyer agreement on 24.10.2011.

26. It is submitted that as per the terms of the agreement, it was specifically agreed that in the eventuality of any dispute, if any, with respect to the subject transferred unit, the same shall be adjudicated through the arbitration mechanism as detailed therein.

Clause no. 49 is being reproduced hereunder:

"Clause 49: All or any dispute arising out or touching upon or in relation to the terms of this Application and/or Flat Buyers agreement including the interpretation and validity of the terms thereof and the rights and obligations of the parties shall be settled amicably by mutual discussion failing which the same shall be settled through Arbitration. The arbitration shall be governed by Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 or any statutory amendments/ modifications thereof for the time being in force. The venue of the arbitration shall be New Delhi and it shall be held by a sole arbitrator who shall be appointed by the Company and whose decision shall be final and binding upon the parties. The Applicant(s) hereby confirms that he/she shall have no objection to this appointment even if the person so appointed as the Arbitrator, is an employee or advocate of the company or is otherwise connected to the Company and the Applicant(s) confirms that notwithstanding such relationship / connection, the Applicant(s) shall have no doubts as to the independence or impartiality of the said Arbitrator. The courts in New Delhi alone shall have the jurisdiction over the disputes arising out of the Application/Apartment Buyers Agreement....."

Thus, in view of above Section 49 of flat buyer's agreement, it is humbly submitted that, the dispute, if any, between the parties are to be referred to arbitration.

27. It is respectfully submitted that the relationship between the complainant and the respondent is governed by the document dated 24.10.2011 executed between them. It is pertinent to

mention herein the complainant is further falsifying his claim from the very fact that, the complainant has filed the instant claim on the alleged delay in delivery of possession of the provisionally booked unit. However, the respondent has vide its letter dated 17.04.2018 already offered possession of the subject unit to the complainant. However, it is the complainant who has till date not taken possession of his unit and have filed the present complainant against the respondent on false and fabricated facts.

28. That the complainant has not come before this hon'ble authority with clean hands and wishes to take advantage of his own misdoings with the help of the provisions of the Act of 2016, which have been propagated for the benefit of innocent customers who are end-users and not defaulters like the complainant in the present complaint.
29. That the complainant and his wife had purchased the subject unit with a speculative intent with sole purpose of investment and monetary gains out of the said investment. It is further submitted that the complainant did his own market research and booked the subject unit on the basis of maximum commercial gains. Since there is a recession in the real estate market, the complainant is levying bald and baseless allegations against the respondent by way of the present complaint.

30. That the complainant from the very beginning was aware, that the period of delivery as defined in clause 21 of flat buyer's agreement is not sacrosanct as in the said clause it is clearly stated that "the Developer shall endeavour to complete the construction of the said building/unit" within the stipulated time. Subject to timely payment of the installments towards the basic sale price. The complainant has failed in observing her part of liability of the clause 21 of the said agreement which has been given a selective reading by the complainant.
31. That it is pertinent to mention here that from the very beginning it was in the knowledge of the complainant, that there is a mechanism detailed in the flat buyer's agreement which covers the exigencies of inordinate delay caused in completion and handing over of the booked unit i.e. enumerated in the "clause 22" of duly executed flat buyer's agreement, which is at page 27 of the flat buyer's agreement filed by the complainant along with their complaint. The respondent carves leave of this authority to refer & rely upon the clause 22 of flat buyer's agreement which is being reproduced hereunder:

"Clause 22 in the eventuality of developer failing to offer the possession of the unit to the buyers within the time as stipulated herein, except for the delay attributable to the buyer/force majeure / vis- majeure conditions, the developer shall pay to the buyer penalty of Rs. 5/- (rupees five only) per square feet (of super area) per month for the period of delay....."

That the complainant being fully aware, having knowledge and are now evading from the truth of its existence and does not seem to be satisfied with the amount offered in lieu of delay. It is thus obvious that the complainant is rescinding from the duly executed contract between the parties.

32. That the bare perusal of clause 22 of the agreement would make it evident that in the event of the respondent failing to offer possession within the proposed timelines, then in such a scenario, the respondent would pay a penalty of Rs.5/- per sq. ft. per month as compensation for the period of such delay. The aforesaid prayer is completely contrary to the terms of the inter-se agreement between the parties. The said agreement fully envisages delay and provides for consequences thereof in the form of compensation to the complainant. Under clause 22 of the agreement, the respondent is liable to pay compensation at the rate of Rs.5/- per sq. ft. per month for delay beyond the proposed timeline. The respondent craves leave of this authority to refer & rely upon the clause 22 of flat buyer's agreement, which is being reproduced as:

"Clause 22 : In the eventuality of Developer failing to offer the possession of the unit to the Buyers within the time as stipulated herein, except for the delay attributable to the Buyer/force majeure / vis-majeure conditions, the Developer shall pay to the Buyer penalty of Rs. 5/- (Rupees Five only) per square feet (of super area) per month for the period of delay"

That the complainant being aware, having knowledge and having given consent of the above mentioned clause/terms of flat buyer's agreement, is now evading themselves from contractual obligations inter-alia from the truth of its existence and does not seem to be satisfied with the amount offered in lieu of delay. It is thus obvious that the complainant is also estopped from the duly executed contract between the parties.

33. That it is a universally known fact that due to adverse market conditions viz. delay due to reinitiating of the existing work orders under GST regime, by virtue of which all the bills of contractors were held between, delay due to the directions by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and National Green Tribunal whereby the construction activities were stopped, non-availability of the water required for the construction of the project work & non-availability of drinking water for labour due to process change from issuance of HUDA slips for the water to totally online process with the formation of GMDA, shortage of labour, raw materials etc., which continued for around 22 months, starting from February'2015.
34. That as per the license to develop the project, EDCs were paid to the state government and the state government in lieu of the EDCs was supposed to lay the whole infrastructure in the licensed area for providing the basic amenities such as drinking water, sewerage, drainage including storm water line, roads etc. That the state government terribly failed to provide the basic amenities due to which the construction progress of the project was badly hit.

35. That furthermore, the Ministry of Environment and Forest (hereinafter referred to as the "MoEF") and the Ministry of Mines (hereinafter referred to as the "MoM") had imposed certain restrictions which resulted in a drastic reduction in the availability of bricks and availability of kiln which is the most basic ingredient in the construction activity. The MoEF restricted the excavation of topsoil for the manufacture of bricks and further directed that no manufacturing of clay bricks or tiles or blocks can be done within a radius of 50 kilometres from coal and lignite based thermal power plants without mixing at least 25% of ash with soil. The shortage of bricks in the region and the resultant non-availability of raw materials required in the construction of the project also affected the timely schedule of construction of the project.
36. That in view of the ruling by the Hon'ble Apex Court directing for suspension of all the mining operations in the Aravalli hill range in state of Haryana within the area of approx. 448 sq. kms in the district of Faridabad and Gurgaon including Mewat which led to a situation of scarcity of the sand and other materials which derived from the stone crushing activities, which directly affected the construction schedules and activities of the project.
37. Apart from the above, the following circumstances also contributed to the delay in timely completion of the project:
- a) That commonwealth games were organized in Delhi in October 2010. Due to this mega event, construction of several big projects including the construction of commonwealth games

village took place in 2009 and onwards in Delhi and NCR region. This led to an extreme shortage of labour in the NCR region as most of the labour force got employed in said projects required for the commonwealth games. Moreover, during the commonwealth games the labour/workers were forced to leave the NCR region for security reasons. This also led to immense shortage of labour force in the NCR region. This drastically affected the availability of labour in the NCR region which had a ripple effect and hampered the development of this complex.

b) Moreover, due to active implementation of social schemes like National Rural Employment Guarantee Act and Jawahar Lal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission, there was a sudden shortage of labour/workforce in the real estate market as the available labour preferred to return to their respective states due to guaranteed employment by the Central /State Government under NREGA and JNNURM schemes. This created a further shortage of labour force in the NCR region. Large numbers of real estate projects, including our project were struggling hard to timely cope up with their construction schedules. Also, even after successful completion of the commonwealth games, this shortage continued for a long period of time. The said fact can be substantiated by newspaper article elaborating on the above-mentioned issue of shortage of labour which was hampering the construction projects in the NCR region.

c) Further, due to slow pace of construction, a tremendous pressure was put on the contractors engaged to carry out various

activities in the project due to which there was a dispute with the contractors resulting into foreclosure and termination of their contracts and we had to suffer huge losses which resulted in delayed timelines. That despite the best efforts, the ground realities hindered the progress of the project.

d) Inability to undertake the construction for approx. 7-8 months due to Central Government's Notification about Demonetization; The respondent had awarded the construction of the project to one of the leading construction companies of India. The said contractor/ company could not implement the entire project for approx. 7-8 months w.e.f. from 9-10 November 2016 the day when the Central Government issued notification with regard to demonetization. During this period, the contractor could not make payment in cash to the labour. During demonetization, the cash withdrawal limit for companies was capped at Rs. 24,000 per week initially whereas cash payments to labour on the site of magnitude of the project in question is Rs. 3-4 lakhs approx. per day and the work at site got almost halted for 7-8 months as bulk of the labour being unpaid went to their hometowns, which resulted into shortage of labour. Hence, the implementation of the project in question got delayed on account of the issues faced by contractor due to the said notification of Central Government. That the said event of demonetization was beyond the control of the respondent company, hence the time period for offer of possession should be deemed to be extended for 6 months on account of the above.

- e) **Orders passed by National Green Tribunal:** In last four successive years i.e. 2015-2016-2017-2018, Hon'ble National Green Tribunal (hereafter referred as "NGT") has been passing orders to protect the environment of the country and especially the NCR region. The hon'ble NGT had passed orders governing the entry and exit of vehicles in NCR region. Also, the hon'ble NGT has passed orders with regard to phasing out the 10-year-old diesel vehicles from NCR. The pollution levels of NCR region have been quite high for couple of years at the time of change in weather in November every year. The contractor of respondent could not undertake construction for 3-4 months in compliance of the orders of hon'ble National Green Tribunal. Due to this, there was a delay of 3-4 months as labour went back to their hometowns, which resulted in shortage of labour in April -May 2015, November-December 2016 and November- December 2017. The district administration issued the requisite directions in this regard. In view of the above, construction work remained very badly affected for 6-12 months due to the above stated major events and conditions which were beyond the control of the respondent and the said period would also require to be added for calculating the delivery date of possession if any. Copy of press release of Environment Pollution (Prevention and Control) Authority (EPCA) for stopping of construction activity in 2018.
- f) **Non-Payment of Instalments by Allottees:** Several other allottees were in default of the agreed payment plan, and the payment of construction linked instalments was delayed or not

made resulting in badly impacting and delaying the implementation of the entire project.

g) Inclement Weather Conditions viz. Gurugram: Due to heavy rainfall in Gurugram in the year 2016 and unfavourable weather conditions, all the construction activities were badly affected as the whole town was waterlogged and gridlocked as a result of which the implementation of the project in question was delayed for many weeks. Even various institutions were ordered to be shut down/closed for many days during that year due to adverse/severe weather conditions.

38. That despite the implementation of the project being affected on account of the above-mentioned force majeure conditions, the respondent being a customer-oriented company completed the construction of the tower in which the unit allotted to the complainant is located and the respondent applied for the grant of the occupation certificate on 21.11.2017 before the Director General, Town & Country Planning Department, Chandigarh, and the same was granted by the concerned authorities on 06.04.2018. As such it is pertinent to mention that the respondent completed the construction of the unit booked by the complainant including the tower before 21.11.2017 wherein the application for grant of occupation certificate was applied by the respondent before the DTCP, Chandigarh.

39. That the flat buyer's agreement has been referred to, for the purpose of getting the adjudication of the instant complaint i.e. the flat buyer agreement dated 24.10.2011 executed much prior to coming into force of the Act of 2016 and the rules of 2017. Further the adjudication of the instant complaint for the purpose of granting interest and compensation, as provided under Act of 2016 has to be in reference to the flat buyer's agreement for sale executed in terms of said Act and said Rules and no other agreement, whereas, the flat buyer's agreement being referred to or looked into in this proceedings is an agreement executed much before the commencement of Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 and such agreement as referred herein above. Hence, cannot be relied upon till such time the new agreement to sell is executed between the parties. Thus, in view of the submissions made above, no relief can be granted to the complainant.
40. That the complainant being aware, having knowledge and having given consent of the terms of flat buyer's agreement, is now evading from their contractual obligations inter-alia from the truth of its existence and does not seem to be satisfied with the amount offered in lieu of delay. It is thus obvious that the complainant is also estopped from the duly executed contract between the parties.

41. That the respondent has made huge investments in obtaining requisite approvals and carrying on the construction and development of 'INDIABULLS ENIGMA' project not limiting to the expenses made on the advertising and marketing of the said project. Such development is being carried on by developer by investing all the monies that it has received from the buyers/customers and through loans that it has raised from financial institutions. In spite of the fact that the real estate market has gone down badly the respondent has managed to carry on the work with certain delays caused due to various above mentioned reasons and the fact that on an average more than 50% of the buyers of the project have defaulted in making timely payments towards their outstanding dues, resulting into inordinate delay in the construction activities, still the construction of the project "INDIABULLS ENIGMA" has never been stopped or abandoned and has now reached its pinnacle in comparison to other real estate developers/promoters who have started the project around similar time period and have abandoned the project due to such reasons.
42. That a bare perusal of the complaint will sufficiently elucidate that the complainant has miserably failed to make a case against the respondent and has merely alleged about delay on part of the respondent in handing over of possession but have failed to

substantiate the same. The fact is that the respondent, has been acting in consonance with the flat buyer's agreement dated 24.10.2011 executed and no contravention in terms of the same can be projected on the respondent. The complainant has made false and baseless allegations with a mischievous intention to retract from the agreed terms and conditions duly agreed in flat buyer's agreement entered between the parties. In view of the same, it is submitted that there is no cause of action in favour of the complainant to institute the present complaint.

43. 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 based on these undisputed documents.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

44. The authority observes that it has territorial as well as subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint.

E. I Territorial jurisdiction

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

E. II Subject matter jurisdiction

The authority has complete jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the promoter as per the provisions of section 11(4) (a) of the Act of 2016 leaving aside compensation which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer if pursued by the complainant at a later stage.

F. Findings on the objections raised by the respondent:

F.I Objection regarding complainant is in breach of agreement for non-invocation of arbitration.

45. The respondent has raised an objection that the complainant has not invoked arbitration proceedings as per the provisions of flat buyer's agreement which contains provisions regarding initiation of arbitration proceedings in case of breach of agreement. The following clause has been incorporated w.r.t arbitration in the buyer's agreement:

"Clause 49: All or any dispute arising out or touching upon or in relation to the terms of this Application and/or Flat Buyers agreement including the interpretation and validity of the terms thereof and the rights and obligations of the parties shall be settled amicably by mutual discussion failing which the same shall be settled through Arbitration The arbitration shall be governed by Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 or any statutory amendments/ modifications thereof for the time being in force. The venue of the arbitration shall be New Delhi and it shall be held by a sole arbitrator who shall be appointed by the Company and whose decision shall be final and binding upon the parties. The Applicant(s) hereby confirms that he/she shall have no objection to this appointment even if the person so appointed as the Arbitrator, is an employee or advocate of the company or is otherwise connected to the Company and the Applicant(s) confirms that notwithstanding such relationship / connection, the Applicant(s) shall have no doubts as to the independence or impartiality of the said Arbitrator. The courts in New Delhi alone shall have the jurisdiction over the disputes arising out of the Application/Apartment Buyers Agreement"

46. The respondent contended that as per the terms & conditions of the application form duly executed between the parties, it was specifically agreed that in the eventuality of any dispute, if any, with respect to the provisional booked unit by the complainant, the same shall be adjudicated through arbitration mechanism. The authority is of the opinion that the jurisdiction of the authority cannot be fettered by the existence of an arbitration clause in the buyer's agreement as it may be noted that section 79 of the Act bars the jurisdiction of civil courts about any matter which falls within the purview of this authority, or the Real Estate Appellate Tribunal. Thus, the intention to render such disputes as non-arbitrable seems to be clear. Also, section 88 of the Act says that the provisions of this Act shall be in addition to and not in derogation of the provisions of any other law for the time being in force. Further, the authority puts reliance on catena of judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, particularly in *National Seeds Corporation Limited v. M. Madhusudhan Reddy & Anr. (2012) 2 SCC 506*, wherein it has been held that the remedies provided under the Consumer Protection Act are in addition to and not in derogation of the other laws in force, consequently the authority would not be bound to refer parties to arbitration even if the agreement between the parties had an arbitration clause. Further, in *Aftab Singh and ors. v. Emaar MGF Land Ltd and ors., Consumer case no. 701 of 2015 decided on 13.07.2017*, the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi (NCDRC) has held that the arbitration clause in agreements between the complainant and

builders could not circumscribe the jurisdiction of a consumer. The relevant paras are reproduced below:

"49. Support to the above view is also lent by Section 79 of the recently enacted Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (for short "the Real Estate Act"). Section 79 of the said Act reads as follows: -

"79. Bar of jurisdiction - No civil court shall have jurisdiction to entertain any suit or proceeding in respect of any matter which the Authority or the adjudicating officer or the Appellate Tribunal is empowered by or under this Act to determine and no injunction shall be granted by any court or other authority in respect of any action taken or to be taken in pursuance of any power conferred by or under this Act."

It can thus, be seen that the said provision expressly ousts the jurisdiction of the Civil Court in respect of any matter which the Real Estate Regulatory Authority, established under Sub-section (1) of Section 20 or the Adjudicating Officer, appointed under Sub-section (1) of Section 71 or the Real Estate Appellate Tribunal established under Section 43 of the Real Estate Act, is empowered to determine. Hence, in view of the binding dictum of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in A. Ayyaswamy (supra), the matters/disputes, which the Authorities under the Real Estate Act are empowered to decide, are non-arbitrable, notwithstanding an Arbitration Agreement between the parties to such matters, which, to a large extent, are similar to the disputes falling for resolution under the Consumer Act.

56. Consequently, we unhesitatingly reject the arguments on behalf of the Builder and hold that an Arbitration Clause in the afore-stated kind of Agreements between the Complainant and the Builder cannot circumscribe the jurisdiction of a Consumer Fora, notwithstanding the amendments made to Section 8 of the Arbitration Act."

47. While considering the issue of maintainability of a complaint before a consumer forum/commission in the fact of an existing arbitration clause in the builder buyer agreement, the Hon'ble Supreme Court - in case titled as *M/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd. V. Aftab Singh in revision petition no. 2629-30/2018 in civil appeal no. 23512-*

23513 of 2017 decided on 10.12.2018 has upheld the aforesaid judgement of NCDRC and as provided in Article 141 of the Constitution of India, the law declared by the Supreme Court shall be binding on all courts within the territory of India and accordingly, the authority is bound by the aforesaid view. The relevant para of the judgement passed by the Supreme Court is reproduced below:

"25. This Court in the series of judgments as noticed above considered the provisions of Consumer Protection Act, 1986 as well as Arbitration Act, 1996 and laid down that complaint under Consumer Protection Act being a special remedy, despite there being an arbitration agreement the proceedings before Consumer Forum have to go on and no error committed by Consumer Forum on rejecting the application. There is reason for not interjecting proceedings under Consumer Protection Act on the strength of an arbitration agreement by Act, 1996. The remedy under Consumer Protection Act is a remedy provided to a consumer when there is a defect in any goods or services. The complaint means any allegation in writing made by a complainant has also been explained in Section 2(c) of the Act. The remedy under the Consumer Protection Act is confined to complaint by consumer as defined under the Act for defect or deficiencies caused by a service provider, the cheap and a quick remedy has been provided to the consumer which is the object and purpose of the Act as noticed above."

48. Therefore, in view of the above judgements and considering the provisions of the Act, the authority is of the view that complainant is well within their rights to seek a special remedy available in a beneficial Act such as the Consumer Protection Act and RERA Act, 2016 instead of going in for an arbitration. Hence, we have no hesitation in holding that this authority has the requisite jurisdiction to entertain the complaint and that the dispute does not require to be referred to arbitration necessarily.

F.II. Objection regarding delay due to force majeure

49. The respondent-promoter raised the contention that the construction of the project was delayed due to force majeure conditions such as commonwealth games held in Delhi, shortage of labour due to implementation of various social schemes by Government of India, slow pace of construction due to a dispute with the contractor, demonetisation, various orders passed by NGT and weather conditions in Gurugram and non-payment of instalment by different allottees of the project but all the pleas advanced in this regard are devoid of merit. First of all the unit in question was booked in the year 2010 and its possession was to be offered by 24.04.2015 so the events taking place such as holding of common wealth games, dispute with the contractor, implementation of various schemes by central govt. etc. do not have any impact on the project being developed by the respondent. Though some allottees may not be regular in paying the amount due but whether the interest of all the stakeholders concerned with the said project be put on hold due to fault of some of the allottees. Thus, the promoter respondent cannot be given any leniency on based of aforesaid reasons and it is well settled principle that a person cannot take benefit of his own wrong.

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

50. 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 flat 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 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."

51. 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."

52. 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 regarding relief sought by the complainant.

Relief sought by the complainant: Direct the respondent to pay interest on the delay in handing over the possession till realization

of the same as well as handover of the possession in view of the violation of section 18 of the Act of 2016.

G.1 Admissibility of delay possession charges

53. 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

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

54. As per clause 21 of the flat buyer's agreement dated 24.10.2011, the possession of the subject unit was to be handed over by of 24.04.2015. Clause 21 of the flat buyer's agreement provides for handover of possession and is reproduced below:

As per clause 21 : The Developer shall endeavour to complete the construction of the said building /Unit within a period of three years, with a six months grace period thereon from the date of execution of the Flat Buyers Agreement subject to timely payment by the Buyer(s) of Total Sale Price payable according to the Payment Plan applicable to him or as demanded by the Developer. The Developer on completion of the construction /development shall issue final call notice to the Buyer, who shall within 60 days thereof, remit all dues and take possession of the Unit.

55. The authority has gone through the possession clause of the agreement. At the outset, it is relevant to comment on the pre-set possession clause of the agreement wherein the possession has

been subjected to all kinds of terms and conditions of this agreement and the complainant not being in default under any provisions of this agreements and in 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 date for handing over possession loses its meaning. The incorporation of such clause in the flat 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.

56. The flat buyer's agreement is a pivotal legal document which should ensure that the rights and liabilities of both builders/promoters and buyers/allottees are protected candidly. The flat buyer's agreement lays down the terms that govern the sale of different kinds of properties like residentials, commercials etc. between the buyer and builder. It is in the interest of both the parties to have a well-drafted flat buyer's agreement which would thereby protect the rights of both the builder and buyer in the

unfortunate event of a dispute that may arise. It should be drafted in the simple and unambiguous language which may be understood by a common man with an ordinary educational background. It should contain a provision about stipulated time of delivery of possession of the apartment, plot or building, as the case may be and the right of the buyers/allottee in case of delay in possession of the unit. In pre-RERA period it was a general practice among the promoters/developers to invariably draft the terms of the apartment buyer's agreement in a manner that benefited only the promoters/developers. It had arbitrary, unilateral, and unclear clauses that either blatantly favoured the promoters/developers or gave them the benefit of doubt because of the total absence of clarity over the matter.

57. **Admissibility of grace period:** The respondent promoter has proposed to complete the construction of the said building/ unit within a period of 3 years, with six months grace period thereon from the date of execution of the flat buyer's agreement. In the present case, the promoter is seeking 6 months' time as grace period. The said period of 6 months is allowed to the promoter for the exigencies beyond the control of the promoter. Therefore, the due date of possession comes out to be 24.04.2015.
58. **Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** The complainant is seeking delay possession charges 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.

59. 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.
60. 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., 20.07.2021 is @ 7.30%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 9.30%.
61. The definition of term 'interest' as defined under section 2(z) 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;"*

Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainant 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 complainant in case of delayed possession charges.

62. On consideration of the circumstances, the evidence and other record and submissions made by the complainant and the respondent and based on the findings of the authority regarding contravention as per provisions of Act, the authority is satisfied that the respondent is in contravention of the provisions of the Act. By virtue of clause 21 of the flat buyer's agreement executed between the parties on 24.10.2011, possession of the booked unit was to be delivered within a period of 3 years from the date of execution of the agreement with a grace period of 6 months, which comes out to be 24.04.2015.
63. 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 06.04.2018. The respondent offered the possession of the unit in question to the complainant only on 17.04.2018, so it can be said that the complainant came to know about the occupation certificate only upon the date of offer of possession. Therefore, in the interest of natural justice, the complainant should be given 2 months' time from the date of offer of possession. This 2 months' of reasonable time is being given to the complainant keeping in mind that even after intimation of possession practically he has 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 from the due date of possession i.e. 24.04.2015 till the expiry of 2 months from the date of offer of possession (17.04.2018) which comes out to be 17.06.2018.

64. Accordingly, it is the failure of the promoter to fulfil its obligations and responsibilities as per the agreement dated 24.10.2011 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., 24.04.2015 till 17.06.2018, 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 and section 19(10) of the Act.


H. Directions of the authority:

65. Hence, the authority hereby passes this order and issue the following directions under section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance of obligation cast upon the promoter as per the function entrusted to the authority under section 34(f) of the act of 2016:

- i. The respondent shall pay interest at the prescribed rate i.e. 9.30% per annum for every month of delay on the amount paid by the complainant from due date of possession i.e. 24.04.2015 till the expiry of 2 months from the date of offer of possession i.e. 17.06.2018 as per section 19(10) of the Act.
- ii. The respondent is directed to pay arrears of interest accrued within 90 days from the date of order.
- iii. The complainant is directed to pay outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment of interest for the delayed period.
- iv. 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 respondent/promoter which is 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.
- v. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainant which is not the part of buyer's agreement. The


respondent is not entitled to charge holding charges from the complainant/allottee at any point of time even after being part of the flat buyer's agreement as per law settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in civil appeal nos. 3864-3889/2020 on 14.12.2020.

66. Complaint stands disposed of.
67. File be consigned to registry.


(Samir Kumar)

Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram


(Vijay Kumar Goyal)

Member

Dated: 20.07.2021

HARERA
GURUGRAM