

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

Complaint no. : 1065 of 2020
First date of hearing: 08.04.2020
Date of decision : 20.07.2021

Malti Gupta

R/o: Villa-119, Adarsh Palm Retreat,
Devarabisanashalli, Bellandur, Outer Ring
Road, Near Intel Campus, Bangalore - 560103

Complainant

Versus

Athena Infrastructure limited

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

Respondent

CORAM:

Shri Samir Kumar
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal

Member
Member

APPEARANCE:

Shri. Pawan Kumar Ray
Shri. Rahul Yadav

Advocate for the complainant
Advocate for the respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated 28.02.2020 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	05.05.2012 (As alleged by the complainant on page 07 of the complaint)
7.	Unit no.	A-144, 14 th floor, Tower/Block A (As on page 25 of the complaint)
8.	Super Area	3400 sq. Ft.
9.	Payment plan	Construction linked payment plan (As per page 38 of the complaint)
10.	Total consideration	Rs. 2,10,13,000/- (As per customer ledger dated 22.11.2018 on page 51 of complaint)
11.	Total amount paid by the complainant	Rs. 2,30,00,249/- (As per customer ledger dated 22.11.2018 on page 52 of complaint)
12.	Conveyance deed	12.03.2019 (As per page 54 of the complaint)
13.	Maintenance agreement	13.03.2019 (As per page 75 of the complaint)
14.	Due date of delivery of possession <i>(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</i>	05.11.2015 (Grace period of 6 months is allowed)

	<p><i>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)</i></p>	
15.	Offer of possession	22.11.2018 (As per page 47 of the complaint)
16.	Occupation Certificate	06.04.2018
17.	Delay in delivery of possession till 22.01.2019 i.e. date of offer of possession (22.11.2018) + 2 months.	3 years 02 months 17 days

B. Facts of the complaint

3. The complainant submitted that the respondent company launched a group residential project by the name of "**Indiabulls Enigma**" (hereinafter "project") and promoted it as an exclusive luxury project. The respondent has made several claims pertaining to the architecture and the landscape of the project such as single point access gated community with 24*7 security, convenient shops and departmental stores within the complex, all existing amenities like schools, shopping mall, jogging tracks, quaint walking trails, skating rink, cricket nets, pool tables and kids play area, health club sauna, gym, yoga and aerobics lounge, spa, jacuzzi, swimming pool,

- relaxing pool, tennis court, coffee shops, kids play area, traffic free podium, party lawn with barbeque counter.
4. That the original allottee, Mr. Amit Gupta and Mrs. Manik Gupta, booked a unit in the aforesaid project on 04.11.2011 and made a payment of Rs. 5,00,000/- via NEFT transaction dated 31.10.2011 as booking amount and the respondent company subsequently issued a billing no. 1146.
 5. That on 05.05.2012, a flat buyer's agreement was executed between the respondent company and the original allottees and as per the agreement flat no. A144 of block A on the 14th floor having super area of 3400 sq. ft. and covered area of 2605.54 sq. ft. Unit allotted was a 4 BHK+ SQ unit with 2 covered car parking for a basic price of Rs. 1,86,20,000/- and for total price of Rs. 2,10,00,000/-.
 6. That in December 2012, the original allottees gifted the said unit to their mother and made the necessary representation before the respondent company for transfer of the unit in their mother's name. Further, on 01.06.2013, the name of the unit was transferred from the original allottees, Mr. Amit Gupta and Mrs. Manik Gupta to the current complainant.
 7. That the complainant opted for the constructed linked payment plan and paid the money as and when fallen due and when demanded by the respondent company. The complainant never

defaulted in payment of installments and always made the payments on time.

8. That as per the flat buyer's agreement dated 05.05.2012 the unit was to be handed over within 3 years from the date of execution of the flat buyers agreement with a grace period of 6 months. The relevant clause of flat buyer's agreement has been produced below:

"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 the timely payment by the Buyer(s) of Total Sale Price payable according to the payment plan applicable to her 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. In the event of his/her failure to take possession of the unit within the stipulated time for any reason whatsoever, he/she shall be liable to bear all taxes, levies, outflows and maintenance charges/ cost and any other levies on account of the allotted Unit along with interest and penalties on the delayed payment, from the dates these are levied/made applicable irrespective of the fact that the Buyer has not taken possession of the Unit or has not been enjoying benefit of the same. The Buyer in such an eventuality shall also be liable to pay the holding charges @ Rs. Five per sq. ft. (of the super area) per month to the Developer, from the date of expiry of said thirty days till the time possession is actually taken over by the Buyer."

9. That the flat buyers agreement was executed on 05.05.2012 and therefore, the respondent company was supposed to hand over the possession by 05.05.2015 (i.e. 3 years from date of execution of flat buyer's agreement and by 05.11.2015 with 6 months grace period. The respondent company failed to offer possession within the prescribed date of 05.05.2015.

10. That after a delay of 3.5 years, the respondent sent a letter of offer of possession dated 22.11.2018 to the complainant. Vide the said letter, the complainant was invited to submit the necessary documents, pay the necessary fees and executed all the necessary documents including the conveyance deed of the flat and simultaneously take the possession of the flat on or before 22.12.2018.
11. That it is submitted that during the intervening period (execution of agreement and until delayed offer of possession), the respondent have never informed the complainant of any force majeure circumstances or any circumstances which is beyond their reasonable control, which has lead to the delay in the completion and development of the project within the stipulated time.
12. That it is pertinent to mention that during the execution of the agreement, the total consideration of the unit was Rs. 2,10,00,000/-. However, in the final statement of account, the respondent company showed the total price of the unit as Rs. 2,30,00,000/-. It is further submitted that the complainant paid the entire sum demanded by the respondent.
13. That while offering the possession, the respondent has not provided any compensation to the complainant for delay of 3.5 years in handing over the possession. However, in the final

statement of account, a penalty of Rs. 4,24,714/- was credited in the account of the complainant. The complainant contacted the respondent with regard to delay compensation as per Act of 2016. But never received any satisfactory reply from them. It is submitted that the respondent ought to have compensated the complainant for such huge delay of 3.5 years in offering the possession of the unit.

14. That the provisions of the allotment letter in relation to the compensation are arbitrary, unilateral, lopsided, illegal and unfair in nature and should not be read in or given emphasis on while deciding the amount of compensation for the complainant. The compensations should be decided as per the provisions of Act of 2016.
15. That since, the complainant had already paid a huge sum of money to the respondent (more than Rs. 2 crores) for the unit, the complainant had no other option but to execute the necessary documents including the conveyance deed of the unit and paid the final amount demanded by the respondent company. Further, it was told that, in case she is not willing to take the possession, the total money paid by her will be forfeited against various clause of the agreement. Due to fear of getting entire money forfeited in case of withdrawal/refusal to take possession and execute the

conveyance deed, the complainant paid all the money as demanded by the respondent and got the Conveyance Deed executed on 12.03.2019 by paying the necessary stamp duty.

16. That on 13.03.2019, the complainant entered into a Maintenance Agreement with the respondent company and the SORIL Infra Resources Ltd.
17. That the arbitrary and unfairness of the apartment buyer agreement can be derived from the clauses 10, 11 and 22. As per the clause 10, the respondent had the right to terminate the agreement and forfeit the earnest money in case of delay in payment of installments and as per clause 11, had the right to accept the delay payment with an interest @ 18% p.a. However, as per the clause 22, in the case of delay in completion of the project, the complainant was entitled to get compensation @ Rs. 5/- per sq. ft. every month of delay beyond 36+6 months. The clause 10, 11 and 22 of the Buyer's Agreement are reproduced below: -

10. Timely payment of the installments / amounts due shall be of the essence of this Agreement. If payment is not made within the period stipulated and or the Buyer commits breach of any of the terms and conditions of this Agreement, then this Agreement shall be liable to be cancelled. In the eventuality of cancellation, earnest money being 15% of the Basic Selling Price would be forfeited and the balance, if any, would be refundable without interest. On cancellation of the Agreement, the Buyer shall also be liable to reimburse to the Developer the amount of brokerage paid, if any, by the Developer towards the booking of the Unit. In any case, all the dues, whatsoever,

including interest, if any, shall be payable before taking possession of the unit.

"11 In exceptional circumstances, the developer may, in its sole discretion, condone the delay in payment by charging interest at the rate of 18% per annum, compounded quarterly on the amounts in default...."

"22 In the eventuality of Developer failing to offer the possession of the unit to the Buyer 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 ft (of the super area) per month for the period of delay...."

It is submitted that the above noted provisions of the allotment related to the compensation are not at all applicable now. The compensation for the complainant has been deliberately formulated to their detriment which is illegal and unsustainable. That the Indian Parliament has enacted and enforced the Act of 2016 to balance the bargaining power of the allottees who have been disadvantaged by the abuse of dominant position by the developers since several years.

18. The Hon'ble Apex Court has also taken cognizance of such one-sided agreements made by the developers and abuse of their dominant position in the case of ***Pioneer Urban Land and Infrastructure Limited versus Govindan Raghavan bearing Civil Appeal No. 12238/2018*** and held that: -

"6.7. A term of a contract will not be final and binding if it is shown that the flat purchasers had no option but to sign on the dotted line, on a contract framed by the builder. The contractual terms of the Agreement dated 08.05.2012 are ex-facie one-sided, unfair, and unreasonable. The incorporation of such one-sided clauses in an agreement constitutes an unfair trade practice as per Section 2 (r)

of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 since it adopts unfair methods or practices for the purpose of selling the flats by the Builder.

7. In view of the above discussion, we have no hesitation in holding that the terms of the Apartment Buyer's Agreement dated 08.05.2012 were wholly one-sided and unfair to the Respondent - Flat Purchaser. The Appellant - Builder could not seek to bind the Respondent with such one-sided contractual terms."

19. Further, The Law Commission of India in its 199th Report, addressed the issue of 'Unfair (Procedural & Substantive) Terms in Contract'. The Law Commission inter-alia recommended that legislation be enacted to counter such unfair terms in contracts. In the draft legislation provided in the Report, it was stated that: -

"A contract or a term thereof is substantively unfair if such contract or the term thereof is in itself harsh, oppressive or unconscionable to one of the parties."

20. That, as per the section 18 of the Act of 2016 the developer is supposed to compensate the allottee for the delay in case the allottee wishes to retain the possession of the apartment. The relevant section of the Act is reproduced below for the kind perusal of this hon'ble tribunal.
21. That as per the principal of parity and the provisions of the Act of 2016, it will be justified if the complainant is compensated by the respondent company for the delay in handing over the possession at the same rate at which the respondent had charged them on delayed payment i.e. 18%. Further, it is also submitted that the conduct of the respondent clearly falls within the definition of the Unfair Practices as defined under Act of 2016.

22. That in view of the above-mentioned facts and circumstances it is only appropriate that this hon'ble authority may be pleased to hold that the respondent delivered the possession to the complainant after a delay of 3.5 years. In view of the above-mentioned facts and circumstances it is only appropriate that this hon'ble authority may please to hold that the compensation (Rs. 4,24,714/-) paid by the respondent for such huge delay of 3.5 years was unfair, inadequate and unjustified.

C. Relief sought by the complainant:

23. The complainant has sought following relief:
- i. Direct the respondent to pay delay interest @18% per annum on the amount paid by the complainant from the promised date of delivery till the actual delivery.
24. 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:

25. 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.

26. That the complainant is the subsequent allottee of the subject unit i.e. A-144, on 14th floor, building block no. A. It is submitted that the subject unit was initially booked jointly in the name of one Mr. Amit Gupta and Mrs. Manik Gupta who had executed a flat buyer agreement dated 05.05.2012 with the respondent. It is further submitted that complainant voluntarily decided to get the subject unit transferred on her name and signed an application form dated 12.04.2013. That the subject unit got transferred in her name through endorsement dated 01.06.2013 followed by allotment letter dated 06.06.2013.
27. That the present compliant filed by the complainant is outside the preview of this authority as the complainant themselves approached the respondent and showed interest to book unit in the project to be developed by the respondent. Thereafter the complainant post understanding the terms & conditions of the agreement(s) had voluntarily executed flat buyer agreement with the respondent on 22.07.2011.(sic 05.05.2012)
28. 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. Thus, the complainant is contractually and statutorily barred from invoking the jurisdiction of this hon'ble authority. Moreover, no cause of action ever arose in favor of the complainant and against the respondent, further the hon'ble authority has no jurisdiction to entertain the present complaint and decide the same hence the present complaint filed by the complainant is liable to be dismissed on the very same ground.

29. That the complainant has already taken physical possession of the subject unit by way of Conveyance Deed dated 12.03.2019. It is pertinent to mention here in that vide possession letter dated 12.03.2019 the complainant has specifically agreed and confirmed that upon the execution of the conveyance deed all the liabilities and obligations of the respondent / developer towards the

complaint with respect to the subject unit stand discharged and satisfied for all intents and purposes.

30. That the relationship between the complainant and the respondent is governed by the document executed between them i.e. application form dated 18.04.2013 for the subject unit. It is pertinent to mention herein that the instant complaint of the Complainant is further falsifying its claim from the very fact that, the complainant have filed the instant claim on the alleged delay in delivery of possession of the provisionally booked unit however the complainant with malafide intention have not disclosed, in fact concealed the material fact from this hon'ble authority that the complainant have been a wilful defaulter since the beginning, and have delayed in clearing her outstanding dues on various occasions.
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. It is submitted that the present complaint is not maintainable, and 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. Clause 21 of the said agreement has been given a selective reading by the complainant even though he conveniently relies on same. The clause reads:

"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 these Flat Buyer' Agreement subject to timely payment by the Buyer(s) of Total Sale Price payable according to the Payment Plan applicable to his or as demanded by the Developer..."

The reading of the said clause clearly shows that the delivery of the unit / apartment in question was subject to timely payment of the instalments towards the basic sale price. As shown in the preceding

paras the complainant has failed in observing his part of liability of the said clause.

33. That the basis of the present complaint is that there is a delay in delivery of possession of the unit in question, and therefore, interest on the deposited amount has been claimed by virtue of the present complaint. It is further submitted that the flat buyer's agreement itself envisages the scenario of delay and the compensation thereof. Therefore, the contention that the possession was to be delivered within 3 years and 6 months of execution of the flat buyer's agreement is based on a complete misreading of the agreement.
34. 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.

35. 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.

36. 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.
37. 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.
38. 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.

39. 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 Jawaharlal 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.

40. That it is pertinent to mention that the project of the respondent i.e., Indiabulls Enigma, which is being developed in an area of around 19.856 acres of land, in which the applicant has invested its money is an on-going project and is registered under The Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 and it is pertinent to note that the respondent has already completed the construction of the phase -1 and phase 1a comprising of towers no. A, D, E, F, G, H, I and J of the project, which also includes the Tower wherein the complainant got her unit booked with the respondent. The complainant has already taken the possession of the subject unit by way of conveyance deed dated 12.03.2019.
41. That based upon the past experiences the respondent has specifically mentioned all the above contingencies in the flat

buyer's agreement executed between the parties and incorporated them in "Clause 39" which is being reproduced hereunder:

Clause 39: "The Buyer agrees that in case the Developer delays in delivery of the unit to the Buyer due to:-

- a. Earthquake, Floods, fire, tidal waves, and/or any act of God, or any other calamity beyond the control of developer.*
- b. War, riots, civil commotion, acts of terrorism.*
- c. Inability to procure or general shortage of energy, labour, equipment, facilities, materials or supplies, failure of transportation, strikes, lock outs, action of labour unions or other causes beyond the control of or unforeseen by the developer.*
- d. Any legislation, order or rule or regulation made or issued by the Govt or any other Authority or,*
- e. If any competent authority(ies) refuses, delays, withholds, denies the grant of necessary approvals for the Unit/Building or,*
- f. If any matters, issues relating to such approvals, permissions, notices, notifications by the competent authority(ies) become subject matter of any litigation before competent court or,*
- g. Due to any other force majeure or vis majeure conditions,*

Then the Developer shall be entitled to proportionate extension of time for completion of the said complex....."

In addition to the reasons as detailed above, there was a delay in sanctioning of the permissions and sanctions from the departments.

42. 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 05.05.2012 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 RERA 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.

43. 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.
44. 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.

45. 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 05.05.2012 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.

46. 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

47. 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.1 Objection regarding complainant is in breach of agreement for non-invocation of arbitration.

48. 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"

49. 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 Appellant 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 aforesaid 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."*

50. 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 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."

51. 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

52. 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, and non-payment of instalment by different

allottee of the project but all the pleas advanced in this regard are devoid of merit. First of all the unit in question was transferred in the year 2013 and its possession was to be offered by 05.11.2015 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 allottee 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 allottee. 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

53. 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."

54. 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."

55. 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 delay interest @18% per annum on the amount paid by the complainant from the promised date of delivery till the actual delivery.

G.1 Admissibility of delay possession charges

56. 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

57. As per clause 21 of the flat buyer's agreement dated 05.05.2012, the possession of the subject unit was to be handed over by of 05.11.2015. 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.

58. 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.

59. 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.

60. **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 05.11.2015.

Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest: The complainant are 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.*

61. 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.
62. 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%.
63. 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;"

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.

64. 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 05.05.2012, 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 05.11.2015. The possession was offered on 22.11.2018 after receiving occupation certificate on 06.04.2018.
65. 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 22.11.2018, 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. 22.11.2015 till the expiry of 2 months from the date of offer of possession (22.11.2018) which comes out to be 22.01.2019.

66. Accordingly, the non-compliance of the mandate contained in section 11 (4)(a) of the Act on the part of the respondent is established. As such the complainant are entitled for delayed possession charges @9.30% p.a. w.e.f. from due date of possession i.e. 05.11.2015 till 22.01.2019, 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.

H. Directions of the authority:

67. 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. 05.11.2015 till the expiry of 2 months from the date of offer of possession i.e. 22.01.2019, as per section 19(10) of the Act. The arrears of interest accrued so far shall be paid to the complainant within 90 days from the date of this order as per rule 16(2) of the rules.
- ii. The respondent is directed to pay arrears of interest accrued within 90 days from the date of order.


68. Complaint stands disposed of.

69. File be consigned to registry.


(Samir Kumar)

Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram


(Vijay Kumar Goyal)

Member

Dated:20.07.2021