

**BEFORE RAJENDER KUMAR, ADJUDICATING OFFICER,  
HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY  
GURUGRAM**

**Complaint no. : 1520 of 2018**  
**Date of decision : 12.10.2021**

HARISH CHANDER GOYAL  
R/O : Flat No. 309, Block B-3,  
Residential SIDCO, Sector- 1,  
IMT, Manesar,  
Haryana

**Complainant**

Versus

IMPERIA WISHFIELD PVT. LTD.  
A-25, Mohan Co-operative  
Industrial Estate, Mathura Road,  
New Delhi

**Respondent**

**APPEARANCE:**

For Complainant:

Mr. Parikshit Kumar (Adv)

For Respondent:

Mr. Rahul Pandey (Adv)

*Handwritten signature*  
A.O.

12r10-21



**ORDER**

1. This is a complaint filed by Sh. Harish Chander Goyal (also called as buyer) under section 31 of The Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (in short, the Act) read with rule 29 of The Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (in short, the Rules) against respondent/developer.
2. As per complainant, on 25.08.2012, he booked a studio apartment in respondent's project **Esfera Elvedor**, situated at sector-37 C, Gurugram and made payment of Rs 2,65,000 as booking amount. The respondent vide allotment letter dated 23.08.2013, allotted unit no. E-049 admeasuring 315 sq. ft. for a total consideration of Rs 31,92,914 including BSP, PLC, EDC and etc. A buyer's agreement dated 24.02.2014, was executed between the parties.
3. As per the Clause 11 (a) of buyer's agreement, respondent had agreed to deliver the possession of the unit within 60 months from the date of execution of buyer's agreement. The respondent failed to complete the construction work and consequently failed to deliver the same till date.
4. As per the payment plan opted by the complainant, he made timely payment of Rs 26,05,435/- i.e 80 % of entire agreed consideration along with miscellaneous and additional



charges etc, but to his utter dismay, the possession of the apartment has not been offered as agreed in buyer's agreement.

5. Even after the receipt of 80 % of total consideration, the construction remained halted for a period of 2 years and when he (complainant) enquired about the progress of construction work he came to know that the respondent does not have requisite sanctions or approvals from concerned authorities. The DTCP license was issued in favour of Prime IT Solutions Pvt. Ltd and not in favour of respondent and even the said license expired on 11.05.2016 i.e. prior to receipt of last payment.
6. There is no development in the project. Construction activities have been stopped since 2016, even after expiry of 6 years from the date of booking. Neither the license no. 47 of 2012 has been transferred in the name of respondent nor the same has been renewed. The construction work is nowhere near completion. Only rudimentary structure of one out of the several buildings has been erected on the project land. He (complainant) even approached respondent for refund of his money, but same (respondent) refused to entertain any request for refund.
7. In another complaint pertaining to same project (**Aparna Rana v M/s Imperia Wishfield Pvt. Ltd & Connected**

*[Handwritten signature]*  
A.O,  
12-10-21



**matters , Complaint No. 1294/2018 )** Hon'ble Authority appointed, Sh. Suresh Kumar Verma as Local Commissioner. As per report of Local Commissioner dated 30.01.2019, neither the license nor building plan for the project was approved in favour of respondent. In said report it is clearly mentioned that construction work is only 30 % complete.

8. Contending that the respondent has breached the fundamental term of the contract, by inordinately delaying the delivery of the possession, the booking of the unit was made in the year 2012 and till date, the project is nowhere near completion, the complainant has sought refund of entire amount of Rs 26,05,435 paid by him till now, along with interest @ 18 % p.a. or at such rates as may be prescribed.
9. The particulars of the project, in tabular form are reproduced as under:

S.No.	Heads	Information
<b>PROJECT DETAILS</b>		
1.	Project name and location	" <b>Esfera Elevador</b> ", Sector 37 C, Gurugram,
2.	Project area	2.00 acres
3.	Nature of the project	Commercial
4.	DTCP license no. and validity status	47 of 2012 dated 12.05.2012 valid upto 11.05.2016

*Handwritten signature*  
A.O.  
12-10-21



5.	RERA Registered/ not registered	<b>Not registered</b>
<b>UNIT DETAILS</b>		
1.	Unit no.	E-049
2.	Unit measuring	315 sq. ft.
3.	Date of Booking	25.08.2012
4.	Date of Buyer's Agreement	24.02.2014,
5.	As per the Clause 11 (a) of buyer's agreement, respondent had agreed to deliver the possession of the unit within 60 months from the date of execution of buyer's agreement	24.02.2019 (Calculated from the date of agreement)
6.	Delay in handing over of possession till date	2 years 07 months
<b>PAYMENT DETAILS</b>		
7.	Total sale consideration	Rs 31,92,914
8.	Amount paid by the complainant	Rs 26,05,435
9.	Payment Plan	Construction Linked Plan

10. The case of respondent as set out in the written reply filed by it, is that it (respondent) had intended to complete the



construction of subject flat on time. Civil structure of the tower in which the subject unit is located , has been completed and only internal and external finishing work is remaining. The respondent is willing to complete the construction work within six to nine months i.e. by June 2022. The delay in handing over the possession has occurred due to certain force majeure circumstances, which include sudden outbreak of Covid 19. Even the Supreme Court banned the construction activities vide its order dated November 2019 which was lifted completely only on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

11. The construction activity was hit by the national lockdown which was imposed by the government of India on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2020 due to pandemic Covid -19 and the same affected the construction activity. Moreover, every year during winters NGT imposes stay on construction activities, due to serious air pollution. The real estate sector has remained worst affected by demonetisation of currency notes as most of the transaction take place in cash. Further, the construction activity was directly affected by shortage of water, Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court vide order dated 16.07.2012 in CWP No. 20032 of 2009 directed to use only treated water from available sewerage treatment plants. Only 10-15 % of required quantity was available at construction sites.

12. It (respondent) averred further that as per collaboration agreement dated 06.12.2012, entered between respondent and

12/10/21  
A.O.



M/s Prime IT Solutions Pvt. Ltd., the respondent is legally entitled to undertake construction and development of the project. Even before the said date of Collaboration Agreement both the companies were under the same management and directors. The building plans of the project under the license No. 47 of 2012 was approved on 25.06.2013. the respondent has become an absolute owner of Licensed land under license No. 47 of 2012 in terms of compromise dated 12.01.2016. As per respondent averred that it is ready to compensate the complainant for delay in handing over possession as per applicable rules. Contending all this respondent requested for 12-15 months time to complete the project and prayed for dismissal of complaint.

13.I have heard learned counsels for parties and perused the record.

14.Respondent has referred various orders passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Court of Punjab and Haryana, which allegedly affected the construction activities and orders of National Green Tribunal, due to which construction work was stopped, respectively. Copy of no such order has been placed on record. Learned counsel for complainants<sup>2</sup> disputed such orders. Moreover, it is not clear as till when construction activities was stopped due to order of NGT. It is not clarified when NGT passed such orders. Its alleged that respondent got DTCP license in 2012 and the same has been expired in the year



2016. The respondent has not placed any document on record to establish that the license has been renewed and it has a valid license to carry out the construction work.
15. The delay in completing construction cannot be justified on such bald claims, without substantiating the same through evidence
16. As far as demonetization of some currency notes is concerned, same has very remotely affected the construction work. There was no restriction on electronic payments. Most of persons have opened their bank accounts. Respondent cannot take shelter of lock down due to covid 19 as due date of possession is stated to be 24.02.2019 there was no pandemic in India at that time.
17. When a buyer has made payment of almost 85 % of total sale consideration of unit, same was well within his/her right to claim possession of his/her dream unit. A buyer cannot be made to wait indefinitely. The respondent has filed an affidavit of Sh. Jay Kumar, project manager, wherein it has been stated that 42 % - 45 % of work is complete and it will take 12 to 18 months to complete remaining construction. Thus, it is an admitted fact that project/unit is not complete even till today.
18. Considering facts stated above, complaint in hands is allowed and respondent is directed to refund entire amount paid by complainant i.e. Rs 26,05,435 within 90 days from today, with interest @ 9.3 % p.a. from the date of each payment, till realisation of amount. Litigation cost of Rs 1

*Handwritten signature*

A.O,

12/10-21





lac is also imposed upon respondent, to be paid to complainant.

File be consigned to registry.

**12.10.2021**

**(RAJENDER KUMAR)**

**Adjudicating Officer**

**Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority**

**Gurugram**

Judgement uploaded on 15.11.2021.