BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, GURUGRAM

Complaint no.	:	**3000 of 2020**
Date of filing complaint:		**17.10.2020**
First date of hearing	:	**01.12.2020**
Date of decision	:	**17.09.2021**

1.	M/s IPSAA Childcare Pvt. Ltd. Address: Plot no.-21A, J Block, Sector-51, Mayfield Garden, Gurugram-122001	**Complainant**
	Versus	
1.	M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Private Limited Regd. Office at: - 304, Kanchan House, Karampura Commercial Complex, New Delhi -110015	**Respondent**

CORAM:	
Shri Samir Kumar	**Member**
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal	**Member**
APPEARANCE:	
Sh. Sukhbir Yadav (Advocate)	Complainant
Sh. M.K Dang (Advocate)	Respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint has been filed by the complainant/allottee 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 under the provision of the Act or the rules and regulations made there under or to the allottees as per the agreement for sale executed inter se.

A. Unit and project related details

2. The particulars of unit details, 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.	Project name and location	"The Corridors", Sector-67A, Gurugram, Haryana
2.	Project area	37.5125 acres
3.	Nature of the project	Group Housing
4.	a) DTCP license no.	05 of 2013 dated 21.02.2013
	b) License valid up to	20.02.2017
	c) Name of the licensee	M/s Precision Realtors Pvt. Ltd. and 5 others
5.	RERA registered/not registered	**Registered** Registered in 3 phases vide **377 of 2017 dated 07.12.2017 (Phase 2)** vide 378 of 2017 dated 07.12.2017 (Phase 1) vide 379 of 2017 dated 07.12.2017 (Phase 3)

	Validity status	30.06.2020 (for phase 1 and 2) 31.12.2023 (for phase 3)
6.	Date of approval of building plan	23.07.2013 (annexure- C4 on page no. 98 of the complaint)
7.	Unit no.	801, 8th floor, tower-A7 (annexure- P3 on page no. 55 of the complaint)
8.	Unit measuring	1726.91 sq. ft. (annexure- P3 on page no. 55 of the complaint)
9.	Date of allotment letter	07.08.2013 (annexure- P2 on page no. 39 of the complaint)
10.	Date of execution of buyer's agreement	10.07.2014 (annexure- P3 on page no. 52 of the complaint)
11.	Payment plan	Instalment payment plan (annexure- P3 on page no. 88 of the complaint)
12.	Subsequent allottee	12.04.2018 (annexure- P4 on page no. 110 of the complaint)
13.	Possession clause	The company proposes to offer the possession of the said apartment to the allottees **within a period of 42 months from the date of approval of the building plans and/or fulfilment of the preconditions imposed thereunder ("Commitment Period"). The allottees further agrees and understands that the company shall additionally**

		be entitled to a period of 180 days ("Grace Period"), after the expiry of the said commitment period to allow for unforeseen delays beyond reasonable control of the company. **(emphasis supplied)**
14.	Due date of delivery of possession	23.01.2017 **Note:** **Calculated from the date of approval of building plan.**
15.	Total consideration	Rs. 1,96,43,643/- (annexure- P6 on page no. 115 of the complaint)
16.	Total amount paid by the complainant	Rs.1,70,32,162/- (annexure- P6 on page no. 115 of the complaint)
17.	Occupation Certificate	31.05.2019 (A6 to A10, B1 to B4 and C3 to C7)
18.	Offer of Possession	13.06.2019 (annexure- R38 on page no. 114 of the reply)
19.	Delay in handing over the possession till offer of possession plus 2 months i.e., 13.08.2019	2 years, 6 months and 21 days
20.	Grace period utilization	Grace period of 180 days is not allowed.

B. Facts of the complaint

The complainant has submitted as under: -

3. That the complainant on 22.03.2013 being relied upon representation and assurance of the office bearers and

marketing staff of the respondent, Mr. Gautam Saxena and Mr. Vaibhav Dhingra (the original allottees) booked a 3 BHK residential flat/apartment, unit no. CD-A7-08-801, on 8th floor, tower A-7, admeasuring 1726.91 sq. ft. with two car parking bays A7-UB-368 & A7-UB-369 in the project of IREO "The Corridor", situated at sector -67A, Gurugram. The flat was purchased under construction link payment plan for a sale consideration of Rs.1,94,18,545.60/- including IDC, EDC, club membership charges, car parking, PLC etc.

4. That the respondent on 07.08.2013 issued an allotment letter in favour of allottees by allotting unit no.- CD-A7-08-801, 8th floor, tower A7, admeasuring 1726.91 sq. ft.

5. That on 10.07.2014, a pre-printed unilateral, one-sided, and arbitrary apartment buyer agreement (hereinafter called "the ABA) was executed inter-se the respondent/promoter and the allottee(s). As per clause 13.3 of ABA, the respondent had to give the possession of the unit within a period of 42 months and 6 months grace period from the date of approval of the building plans and/or fulfilment of the preconditions imposed thereunder. The building plans were approved on 21.03.2013 and the ABA was executed on 10.07.2014, therefore the due date of possession was 10.07.2018 (with grace period).

6. That in september 2016, on request of the allottees, the respondent changed the original allotted unit no. CD-A7-08-801 to new unit no. CD-A7-07-704.

7. That on 10.04.2018, M/s Ipsaa Childcare Private Limited (through its authorized signatory/ Managing Director of the company Mr. Sunil Kumar Goel) purchased unit no- CD-A7-07-704 with two car parking bays no. - A7-UB-368 & A7-UB-369 from the original allottees with the permission of the respondent. Further, the respondent endorsed the name of the present complainant in its record and issued an endorsement/nomination/ assignment of rights letter in favour of the present complainant, M/s Ipsaa Childcare Private Limited by transferring all the onward rights/obligations from the original allottees in respect of the unit no.-CD-A7-07-704 in the subject project. The complainant was assured by the respondent that the project was about to be completed and would get the possession of the flat as on due date of possession i.e., 10.07.2018.

8. That the complainant continued to pay the remaining instalments as per the payment schedule of the ABA and had already paid more than 87% of the amount i.e., Rs.1,70,32,162/- out of the total cost of the apartment, along with interest and other allied charges of the actual purchase price, but when the complainant observed that there was no progress in the construction of the flat as well as the project for a long time, they raised their grievances to the respondent. That the complainant was always ready and willing to pay the remaining instalments, provided that there was some progress in the construction of the flat.

9. That the respondent on 13.06.2019, issued "notice of possession" to the allottee for unit no-CD-A7-07-704 with two car parking bays no.- A7-UB-368 & A7-UB-369 and asked for payment of Rs.26,11,480/- under different heads i.e., development charges Rs.1,12,007/- (originally development charges were Rs.5,66,271/- which has been paid), the club membership charges Rs.1,25,000/- (50% club charge has been paid and the club is yet not constructed), internal electrical connection charges Rs.56,228/- (which were not part of BBA) etc. It is pertinent to mention here that the due date of possession was 10.07.2018 and the respondent issued a notice of possession on 13.06.2019 which is delayed by 11 months.
10. That the respondent on 20.01.2020 issued a statement of account, which shows that till 26.09.2017, the complainant had paid Rs.1,70,32,162/- i.e., 87% of the total sale price of the apartment/unit.
11. That the complainant on 18.09.2019 and 24.06.2020, (through A.R.) visited the project site of the respondent and was stunned to see that the project was not completed, whereas as per ABA the respondent had to give the possession by July 2018. It is pertinent to place on record that at the time of receiving booking amount, the respondent promised for luxury living and assured for football field, school, hospital, retail, clubhouse, creche, jogging trail, spa, café, and commercial centre, within the project complex. It is

material to mention here that construction activities were going on and heavy machinery was installed at the project site. It is highly pertinent to mention here that connecting the road of the project & the basic amenities promised as per ABA were not yet completed. Photographs of the site clearly demonstrates that it would take more than 1 year to finish the project in all aspects.

12. That the complainant's main grievance in the present complaint is that despite the complainant having paid more than 87% of the actual amount for the said flat and being ready and willing to pay the remaining amount due (if any), the respondent has failed to deliver the possession of the flat with amenities.

13. That the complainant purchased the flat with the intention that after the purchase, the family of its director will live in the flat. That it was promised by the respondent at the time of receiving the payment for the flat that the possession of the fully constructed flat along with like basement and surface parking, landscaped lawns, club/ pool, EWS etc. as shown in the brochure at the time of sale, would be handed over to the complainant as soon as the construction work was complete i.e., by July 2018 (42 months and 6 months grace period from the execution of apartment buyer agreement). It is pertinent to mention here that project was already delayed by more than 20 months till March and the respondent had not provided all the amenities as mentioned

in the apartment buyer agreement.

14. That the respondent/builder did not give the possession of the flat on time which had caused huge financial losses and mental agony to the complainant. That the facts and circumstances as enumerated above can only lead to the conclusion that, service is deficient, on the part of the respondent and as such, they are liable to be punished and compensate the complainant of the money paid by it along with interest and litigation cost.

15. That the cause of action for the present complaint arose in or around 2014 when the apartment buyer's agreement containing unfair and unreasonable terms was, for the first time, forced upon the allottees. The cause of action again arose in september 2017, when the respondent failed to handover the possession of the flat as per the terms of the apartment buyer's agreement. The cause of action further arose on various occasions, including on a) Aug. 2017; b) March 2018; c) July 2018; d) January 2019; e) Aug 2019; f) June 2020; and on various other occasions, when protests were lodged with the respondent for a refund of the paid money. The cause of action is still persisting and will continue to subsist until, such time as this authority restrains the respondent by an order of injunction and/or passes the necessary orders.

16. That as per section 12 of the said Act, the promoter is liable to return the entire investment along with interest to the

allottees of an apartment, building or project if the promoter gives any incorrect or false statement etc. It is submitted that the builder sold the flat with misleading commitments and allured various homeowners including the complainant to invest in the said Project with a false date of possession.

17. That the present complaint is not for seeking compensation, and without prejudice to the above, the complainant reserves the right to file a complaint with the Adjudicating Officer for compensation.

18. That the complainant does not wish to withdraw from the project. The promoter has not fulfilled its obligations therefore as per section 11(4) and section 18 of the said Act, the promoter is liable and obligated to pay interest on the delay at the prescribed rate of interest.

C. Relief sought by the complainant.

19. The complainant has sought following relief(s):

(i) Direct the respondent to pay interest at prescribed rate from the due date of possession till the physical possession of the flat as per section 18(1) of the Act.

(ii) Direct the respondent to handover the physical possession of the flat after completing it in all aspects as per the specifications mentioned in the apartment buyer's agreement and the brochure within 12 months from the date of filing this complaint.

D. Reply by the respondent.

The respondent has contested the complaint on the following grounds: -

20. That the respondent is a reputed real estate company having immense goodwill, comprised of law abiding and peace-loving persons and has always believed in satisfaction of its customers. The respondent has developed and delivered several prestigious projects such as 'Grand Arch', 'Victory Valley', 'Skyon' and 'Uptown' and in most of these projects large number of families have already shifted after having taken possession and Resident Welfare Associations have been formed which are taking care of the day to day needs of the allottees of the respective projects.

21. That the original allottees Mr. Gautam Saxena and Mr. Vaibhav Dhingra, after checking the veracity of the project namely, 'The Corridors', sector 67A, Gurugram had applied for allotment of an apartment vide their booking application form dated 22.03.2013. The original allottees agreed to be bound by the terms and conditions of the booking application form.

22. That based on the said application, the respondent vide its allotment offer letter dated 07.08.2013 allotted to the original allottees apartment no. CD-A7-08-801 having tentative super area of 1726.91 sq. ft. for a sale consideration of Rs.1,94,18,545.58/-. It is submitted that three copies of the apartment buyer's agreement were sent to the original allottees by the respondent vide letter dated 31.03.2014. However, the same were executed by the original allottees on

10.07.2014 and returned to the respondent only after reminder dated 28.05.2014 was sent by the respondent. The original allottees agreed to be bound by the terms contained in the apartment buyer's agreement. It is pertinent to mention herein that when the original allottees had booked the unit with the respondent, the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 was not in force and the provisions of the same cannot be applied retrospectively.

23. That the respondent raised payment demands from the original allottees in accordance with the agreed terms and conditions of the allotment as well as of the payment plan and the original allottees were defaulters from the very inception. It was submitted that vide payment request letter dated 14.04.2013, the respondent had raised the payment demand towards the second instalment for the net payable amount of Rs.19,46,912/-. However, the same was credited towards the total sale consideration amount only after reminder dated 14.05.2013 was sent by the respondent.

24. That vide payment request letter dated 18.03.2014, the respondent had raised the payment demand towards the third instalment for the net payable amount of Rs.25,89,964.56/-. However, the same was paid by the original allottees only after reminder dated 13.04.2014 was issued by the respondent.

25. That vide payment request letter dated 27.01.2015, the respondent raised the fourth instalment demand for the net payable amount of Rs.26,95,110.74/-. However, the original

allottees remitted the due amount only after reminders dated 22.02.2015 and 24.03.2015 were sent by the respondent.

26. That on account of the request of the original allottees, the payment plan was changed to the plan with the relaxed milestones and the same was intimated to the original allottees vide letter dated 14.08.2015. Thereafter, vide payment request letter dated 10.09.2015, the respondent raised the fifth instalment demand for the net payable amount of Rs.23,44,503.76/-. However, the original allottees remitted the due amount only after reminder dated 07.10.2015 was sent by the respondent.

27. That vide payment request letter dated 02.11.2015, the respondent raised the sixth instalment demand for the net payable amount of Rs.13,95,568.83/-. However, the original allottees failed to remit the amount despite reminders dated 07.01.2016 and 11.02.2016 and the remaining due amount was adjusted in the next payment instalment as arrears.

28. That vide payment request letter dated 01.12.2015, the respondent raised the seventh instalment demand for the net payable amount of Rs.23,85,647.79/-. However, the original allottees failed to remit the complete amount despite reminders dated 07.01.2016 and 10.02.2016 and the remaining due amount was adjusted in the next payment instalment as arrears.

29. That vide payment request letter dated 03.02.2016, the respondent raised the eighth instalment demand for the net payable amount of Rs.34,06,079.37/-. However, the original

allottees failed to remit the complete amount despite reminders dated 29.02.2016 and 23.03.2016 and the remaining due amount was adjusted in the next payment instalment as arrears.

30. That as per the agreed payment schedule vide payment request dated 01.03.2016, the respondent raised the ninth installment demand of net payable amount of Rs.46,76,510.93/-. However, the respondent received the amount only after reminders dated 28.03.2016 and 19.04.2016 were issued by the respondent.

31. That the original allottees vide their email dated 23.3.2016 requested the respondent to reassign a new unit in the same project of the respondent on account of inability to pay the instalments due to the financial crisis at their end. The respondent being a customer-oriented company acceded to the request of the original allottees vide its letter dated 16.8.2016 and intimated them that they were left with no right, claim or interest with respect to the previous unit i.e., CD-A7-08-801 and a new unit CD-A7-07-704 was allotted to the original allottees. All amounts paid by the original allottees for unit no. CD-A7-08-801 was adjusted towards the sale consideration for unit no. CD-A7-07-704.

32. That the original allottees and the complainant thereafter signed the nomination/transfer agreement on 9.4.2018 and submitted the same to the respondent wherein the complainant admitted that all rights, title and interest of the original allottees shall vest with it and it shall enjoy the same

subject to the obligations in the agreement. The complainant vide clauses 7 and 8 of the said nomination agreement admitted that it shall forego and waive its right to receive any compensation for delay in handing over the possession or any rebate from the respondent and to that extent the apartment buyer's agreement would stand modified. The complainant had also addressed a letter dated 9.4.2018 to the respondent wherein it had acknowledged that it shall be bound by all the terms and conditions of the respondent including the terms and conditions of the agreement. It was also admitted by the complainant in the said letter that it shall pay the entire balance sale consideration alongwith other charges as per the terms and conditions. The complainant had also submitted an affidavit dated 09.04.2018 wherein it had again acknowledged vide clause 4 that it shall waive and forego the right to receive compensation for delay in handing over the possession and to that extent the apartment buyer agreement shall stand modified. The respondent had after scrutiny of the application as well as of the documents, vide letter dated 12.4.2018 assigned all the rights of the original allottees to the complainant and all the documents were endorsed in the name of the complainant.

33. That the possession of the unit was to be offered to the complainant in accordance with the agreed terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement as mentioned in clause 13.3. Furthermore, the complainant has further agreed for an

extended delay period of 12 months from the date of expiry of the grace period as per clause 13.5 of the apartment buyer's agreement.

34. That from the aforesaid terms of the buyer's agreement, it is evident that the time was to be computed from the date of receipt of all requisite approvals. Even otherwise construction can't be raised in the absence of the necessary approvals. It is pertinent to mention here that it has been specified in sub- clause (iv) of clause 17 of the approval of building plan dated 23.07.2013 of the said project that the clearance issued by the Ministry of Environment and Forest, Government of India had to be obtained before starting the construction of the project. It was submitted that the environment clearance for construction of the said project was granted on 12.12.2013. Furthermore, in clause 39 of part-A of the environment clearance dated 12.12.2013 it was stated that fire safety plan was to be duly approved by the fire department before the start of any construction work at site. It is pertinent to mention herein that as per clause 35 of the environment clearance certificate dated 12.12.2013, the project was to obtain permission of Mines & Geology Department for excavation of soil before the start of construction. The requisite permission from the Department of Mines & Geology Department has been obtained on 04.03.2014.

35. That the respondent submitted that last of the statutory approvals which forms a part of the pre-conditions was the

fire scheme approval which was obtained on 27.11.2014 and that the time period for offering the possession, according to the agreed terms of the buyer's agreement would have lapsed only on 27.11.2019. The complainant is trying to mislead this authority by making baseless, false and frivolous averments. The respondent completed the construction of the tower in which the unit allotted to the complainant is located and applied for the grant of the occupation certificate on 06.07.2017. The occupation certificate was granted by the concerned authorities on 31.05.2019. Furthermore, the respondent had even offered the possession of the unit to the complainant vide notice of possession dated 13.06.2019.

36. That complainant was bound to take the possession of the unit after making payment of the due amount and completing the documentation formalities as the Holding Charges are being accrued as per the terms of the apartment buyer's agreement and the same is known to the complainant as is evident from a bare perusal of the notice of possession. However, the complainant had not done the needful till date.

37. That although the respondent has offered the possession of the apartment prior to the elapse of the due date of handing over of the possession, it is pertinent to mention herein that the implementation of the said project was hampered due to non-payment of instalments by the allottees on time and also due to the events and conditions which were beyond the control of the respondent and which have materially affected the construction and progress of the project. Some of the force majeure

events/conditions which were beyond the control of the respondent and affected the implementation of the project and are as under :

I. **Inability to undertake the construction for approx. 7-8 months due to Central Government's Notification with regard to Demonetization:** [Only happened second time in 71 years of independence hence beyond control and could not be foreseen]. 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 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 to the labour in cash and as majority of casual labour force engaged in construction activities in India do not have bank accounts and are paid in cash on a daily basis. During demonetization the cash withdrawal limit for companies was capped at Rs. 24,000 per week initially whereas cash payments to labour on a site of the magnitude of the project in question are Rs. 3-4 lakhs 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 due on account of issues faced by contractor due to the said notification of Central Government.

Further there are studies of Reserve Bank of India and independent studies undertaken by scholars of different institutes/universities and also *newspaper reports of Reuters of the relevant period of 2016-17 on the said issue of impact of demonetization on real estate industry and construction labour.

The Reserve Bank of India has published reports on impact of Demonetization. In the report- "Macroeconomic Impact of Demonetization", it has been observed and mentioned by Reserve Bank of India at page no. 10 and 42 of the said report that the construction industry was in negative during Q3 and Q4 of 2016-17 and started showing improvement only in April 2017.

Furthermore, there have been several studies on the said subject matter and all the studies record the conclusion that during the period of demonetization the migrant labour went to their native places due to shortage of cash payments and construction and real estate industry suffered a lot and the pace of construction came to halt/ or became very slow due to non-availability of labour. Some newspaper/print media reports by Reuters etc. also reported the negative impact of demonetization on real estate and construction sector. That in view of the above studies and reports, the said event of demonetization was

beyond the control of the respondent, hence the time period for offer of possession should deemed to be extended for 6 months on account of the above.

II. **Orders Passed by National Green Tribunal:** In last four successive years i.e. 2015-2016-2017-2018, Hon'ble National Green Tribunal 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 following, 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 is also

required to be added for calculating the delivery date of possession. Copy of the Order dated 7.04.2015 passed by NGT is annexed as **Annexure R-17.** Copies of Studies of Reserve Bank of India and other studies and news reports are **Annexure R18 (Colly).** Copy of press release of Environment Pollution (Prevention and Control) Authority (EPCA) for stopping of construction activity in 2018 is **Annexure R19.**

III. **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.

IV. **Inclement Weather Conditions viz. Gurugram:** Due to heavy rainfall in Gurugram in the year 2016 and unfavorable 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 the complainant is real estate investors who had booked the unit in question with a view to earn quick profit in a short period. However, it appears that their calculations have gone wrong on

account of severe slump in the real estate market and the complainant do not have sufficient funds to honour their commitments and now wants to harass and pressurize the respondent to submit to its unreasonable demands on highly flimsy and baseless grounds. Such malaise tactics of the complainant cannot be allowed to succeed.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

39. The respondent has raised an objection regarding jurisdiction of authority to entertain the present complaint. The authority observes that it has territorial as well as subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint for the reasons given below.

E. I Territorial jurisdiction

As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town and Country Planning Department, Haryana the jurisdiction of Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram district for all purposes. 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

Section 11(4)(a) of the Act, 2016 provides that the promoter shall be responsible to the allottee as per agreement for sale. Section 11(4)(a) is reproduced as hereunder:

Section 11(4)(a)

Be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions under the provisions of this Act or the rules and regulations made thereunder or to the allottees as per the agreement for sale, or to the association of allottees, as the case may be, till the conveyance of all the apartments, plots or buildings, as the case may be, to the allottees, or the common areas to the association of allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be;

The provision of assured returns is part of the builder buyer's agreement, as per clause 15 of the BBA dated..... Accordingly, the promoter is responsible for all obligations/responsibilities and functions including payment of assured returns as provided in Builder Buyer's Agreement.

Section 34-Functions of the Authority:

34(f) of the Act provides to ensure compliance of the obligations cast upon the promoters, the allottees and the real estate agents under this Act and the rules and regulations made thereunder.

So, in view of the provisions of the Act quoted above, the authority has complete jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the promoter 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 jurisdiction of the complaint w.r.t the apartment buyer's agreement executed prior to coming into force of the Act.

40. The respondent submitted that the complaint is neither maintainable nor tenable and is liable to be outrightly dismissed as the apartment buyer's agreement was executed

between the complainant and the respondent prior to the enactment of the Act and the provision of the said Act cannot be applied retrospectively.

41. The authority is of the view 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. 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."

42. 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."

43. 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 and regulations made thereunder and are not unreasonable or exorbitant in nature. Hence, in the light of above-mentioned reasons, the contention of the respondent w.r.t. jurisdiction stands rejected.

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

44. The respondent submitted that the complaint is not maintainable for the reason that the agreement contains an arbitration clause which refers to the dispute resolution mechanism to be adopted by the parties in the event of any dispute and the same is reproduced below for the ready reference:

> *"35. Dispute Resolution by Arbitration*
> *"All or any disputes arising out or touching upon in relation to the terms of this Agreement or its termination including the interpretation and validity of the terms thereof and the respective rights and obligations of the parties shall be settled amicably by mutual discussions failing which the same shall*

be settled through reference to a sole Arbitrator to be appointed by a resolution of the Board of Directors of the Company, whose decision shall be final and binding upon the parties. The allottee hereby confirms that it shall have no objection to the appointment of such sole Arbitrator even if the person so appointed, is an employee or Advocate of the Company or is otherwise connected to the Company and the Allottee hereby accepts and agrees that this alone shall not constitute a ground for challenge to the independence or impartiality of the said sole Arbitrator to conduct the arbitration. The arbitration proceedings shall be governed by the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 or any statutory amendments/ modifications thereto and shall be held at the Company's offices or at a location designated by the said sole Arbitrator in Gurgaon. The language of the arbitration proceedings and the Award shall be in English. The company and the allottee will share the fees of the Arbitrator in equal proportion".

45. 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.

46. 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 afore-stated kind of Agreements between the Complainants 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 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 his 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. In the light of the above-mentioned reasons, the authority is of the view that the objection of the respondent stands rejected.

G. Findings regarding relief sought by the complainant.

G.I Delay possession charges: To direct the respondent to pay interest at prescribed rate from the due date of possession till the physical possession of the flat as per section 18(1) of the Act.

49. In the present complaint, the complainant intend to continue with the project and is seeking delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest on amount already paid by them

as provided under the proviso to section 18(1) of the Act which reads as under:-

> ***"Section 18: - Return of amount and compensation***
>
> *18(1). If the promoter fails to complete or is unable to give possession of an apartment, plot, or building, —*
>
> .....
>
> *Provided that where an allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, he shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay, till the handing over of the possession, at such rate as may be prescribed."*

50. Clause 13.3 of the apartment buyer's agreement (in short, the agreement) dated 10.07.2014, provides for handing over possession and the same is reproduced below:

> *"**13.3** Subject to Force Majeure, as defined herein and further subject to the Allottees having complied with all its obligations under the terms and conditions of this Agreement and not having defaulted under any provision(s) of this Agreement including but not limited to the timely payment of all dues and charges including the total Sale Consideration, registration charges, stamp duty and other charges and also subject to the Allottees having complied with all formalities or documentation as prescribed by the Company, the company proposes to offer the possession of the said apartment to the allottees within a period of 42 months from the date of approval of the Building plans and/or fulfilment of the preconditions imposed thereunder ("**Commitment Period**"). The Allottees further agrees and understands that the company shall additionally be entitled to a period of 180 days ("**Grace Period**"), after the expiry of the said Commitment Period to allow for unforeseen delays beyond reasonable control of the company."*

51. The apartment 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 apartment 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 apartment 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 with regard to stipulated time of delivery of possession of the apartment, plot or building, as the case may be and the right of the buyer/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.

52. 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 apartment 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.

53. The respondent promoter has proposed to handover the possession of the subject apartment within a period of 42 months from the date of approval of building plans and/or fulfilment of the preconditions imposed thereunder plus 180 days grace period for unforeseen delays beyond the

reasonable control of the company i.e., the respondent/promoter.

54. Further, in the present case, it is submitted by the respondent promoter that the due date of possession should be calculated from the date of fire scheme approval which was obtained on 27.11.2014, as it is the last of the statutory approvals which forms a part of the preconditions. The authority in the present case observed that, the respondent have not kept the reasonable balance between his own rights and the rights of the complainant/allottee. The respondent have acted in a pre-determined and preordained manner. The respondent have acted in a highly discriminatory and arbitrary manner. The unit in question was booked by the complainant on 22.03.2013 and the apartment buyer's agreement was executed between the respondent and the complainant on 10.07.2014. The date of approval of building plan was 23.07.2013. It will lead to a logical conclusion that that the respondent would have certainly started the construction of the project. On a bare reading of the clause 13.3 of the agreement reproduced above, it becomes clear that the possession in the present case is linked to the "fulfilment of the preconditions" which is so vague and ambiguous in itself. Nowhere in the agreement it has been

defined that fulfilment of which conditions forms a part of the pre-conditions, to which the due date of possession is subjected to in the said possession clause. If the said possession clause is read in entirety, the time period of handing over possession is only a tentative period for completion of the construction of the flat in question and the promoter is aiming to extend this time period indefinitely on one eventuality or the other. Moreover, the said clause is an inclusive clause wherein the "fulfilment of the preconditions" has been mentioned for the timely delivery of the subject apartment. It seems to be just a way to evade the liability towards the timely delivery of the subject apartment. According to the established principles of law and the principles of natural justice when a certain glaring illegality or irregularity comes to the notice of the adjudicator, the adjudicator can take cognizance of the same and adjudicate upon it. The inclusion of such vague and ambiguous types of clauses in the agreement which are totally arbitrary, one sided and totally against the interests of the allottees must be ignored and discarded in their totality. In the light of the above-mentioned reasons, the authority is of the view that the date of sanction of building plans ought to be taken as the

date for determining the due date of possession of the unit in question to the complainant.

55. Here, the authority is diverging from its earlier view i.e., earlier the authority was calculating/assessing the due date of possession from date approval of firefighting scheme (as it the last of the statutory approval which forms a part of the pre-conditions) i.e., 27.11.2014 and the same was also considered/observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal no. 5785 of 2019 titled as '***IREO Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. v/s Abhishek Khanna and Ors.***' by observing as under: -

> *"With the respect to the same project, an apartment buyer filed a complaint under Section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 (RERA Act) read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation & Development) rules, 2017 before the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram (RERA). In this case, the authority vide order dated 12.03.2019 held that since the environment clearance for the project contained a pre-condition for obtaining fire safety plan duly approved by the fire department before the starting construction, the due date of possession would be required to be computed from the date of fire approval granted on 27.11.2014, which would come to 27.11.2018. Since the developer had failed to fulfil the obligation under Section 11(4)(a) of this Act, the developer was liable under proviso to Section 18 to pay interest at the prescribed rate of 10.75% per annum on the amount deposited by the complainant, upto the date when the possession was offered. However, keeping in view the status of the project, and the interest of other allottees, the authority was of the view that refund cannot be allowed at this*

stage. The developer was directed to handover the possession of the apartment by 30.06.2020 as per the registration certificate for the project."

56. On 23.07.2013, the building plans of the project were sanctioned by the Directorate of Town and Country Planning, Haryana. Clause 3 of the sanctioned plan stipulated that an NOC/ clearance from the fire authority shall be submitted within 90 days from the of issuance of the sanctioned building plans. Also, under section 15(2) and (3) of the Haryana Fire Service Act, 2009, it is the duty of the authority to grant a provisional NOC within a period of 60 days from the date submission of the application. The delay/failure of the authority to grant a provisional NOC cannot be attributed to the developers. But here the sanction building plans stipulated that the NOC for fire safety (provisional) was required to be obtained within a period of 90 days from the date of approval of the building plans, which expired on 23.10.2013. It is pertinent to mention here that the developers applied for the provisional fire approval on 24.10.2013 (as contented by the respondent herein the matter of Civil Appeal no. 5785 of 2019 titled as '***IREO Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. v/s Abhishek Khanna and Ors***.) after the expiry of the mandatory 90 days period got over. The application filed was deficient and casual and did not provide the requisite. The respondent submitted the corrected sets of drawings as per the NBC-2005 fire scheme only on 13.10.2014 (as contented by the respondent herein the

matter of Civil Appeal no. 5785 of 2019 titled as ***'IREO Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. v/s Abhishek Khanna and Ors.)***, which reflected the laxity of the developers in obtaining the fire NOC. The approval of the fire safety scheme took more than 16 months from the date of the building plan approval i.e., from 23.07.2013 to 27.11.2014. The builders failed to give any explanation for the inordinate delay in obtaining the fire NOC. So, the complainant/allottee should not bear the burden of mistakes/ laxity or the irresponsible behaviour of the developer/respondent and seeing the fact that the developer/respondent did not even apply for the fire NOC within the mentioned time. It is a well settled law that no one can take benefit out of his own wrong. In light of the above-mentioned facts the respondent/ promoter should not be allowed to take benefit out of his own mistake just because of a clause mentioned i.e., fulfilment of the preconditions even when they did not even apply for the same in the mentioned time frame.

57. **Admissibility of grace period:** The respondent promoter has proposed to hand over the possession of the apartment within 42 months from the date of sanction of building plan and/or fulfilment of the preconditions imposed thereunder which comes out to be 23.01.2017. The respondent promoter has sought further extension for a period of 180 days after the expiry of 42 months for unforeseen delays in respect of the said project. The respondent raised the contention that the construction of the project was delayed due to *force*

majeure conditions including demonetization and the order dated 07.04.2015 passed by the Hon'ble NGT including others.

(i) **Demonetization:** It was observed that due date of possession as per the agreement was 23.01.2017 wherein the event of demonetization occurred in November 2016. By this time, major construction of the respondents' project must have been completed as per timeline mentioned in the agreement executed between the parties. Therefore, it is apparent that demonetization could not have hampered the construction activities of the respondent project that could lead to the delay of more than 2 years. Thus, the contentions raised by the respondent in this regard are rejected.

(ii) **Order dated 07.04.2015 passed by the Hon'ble NGT:** The order dated 07.04.2015 relied upon by the respondent promoter states that

> *"In these circumstances we hereby direct state of U.P., Noida and Greater NOIDA Authority, HUDA, State of Haryana and NCT, Delhi to immediately direct stoppage of construction activities of all the buildings shown in the report as well as at other sites wherever, construction is being carried on in violation to the direction of NGT as well as the MoEF guideline of 2010."*

A bare perusal of the above makes it apparent that the above-said order was for the construction activities which were in violation of the NGT direction and MoEF guideline of 2010, thereby, making it evident that if the construction of the respondents' project was stopped then it was due to the fault of the respondent themselves and they cannot be allowed to

take advantage of their own wrongs/faults/deficiencies. Also, the allottees should not be allowed to suffer due to the fault of the respondent promoter. It may be stated that asking for extension of time in completing the construction is not a statutory right nor has it been provided in the rules. This is a concept which has been evolved by the promoters themselves and now it has become a very common practice to enter such a clause in the agreement executed between the promoter and the allotee. It needs to be emphasized that for availing further period for completing the construction the promoter must make out or establish some compelling circumstances which were in fact beyond his control while carrying out the construction due to which the completion of the construction of the project or tower or a block could not be completed within the stipulated time. Now, turning to the facts of the present case the respondent promoter has not assigned such compelling reasons as to why and how they shall be entitled for further extension of time 180 days in delivering the possession of the unit. Accordingly, this grace period of 180 days cannot be allowed to the promoter at this stage.

58. **Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** The complainant is seeking delay possession charges at the prescribed rate however, proviso to section 18 provides that where an allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, they 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 17.09.2021 is 7.30%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 9.30% per annum.

61. 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;"*

62. 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 delay possession charges.

63. On consideration of the circumstances, the evidence and other record and submissions made by the parties, the authority is satisfied that the respondent is in contravention of the provisions of the Act. By virtue of apartment buyer's

agreement executed between the parties on 10.07.2014, the possession of the booked unit was to be delivered within 42 months from the date of approval of building plan (23.07.2013) which comes out to be 23.01.2017. The grace period of 180 days is not allowed in the present complaint for the reasons mentioned above. Accordingly, 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 complainant is entitled to delayed possession charges at the prescribed rate of interest i.e., 9.30% p.a. for every month of delay on the amount paid by the complainant to the respondent till offer of possession of the booked unit i.e., 13.06.2019 plus two months which comes out to be 13.08.2019 as per the provisions of 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: -

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

i. The respondent is directed to pay the interest at the prescribed rate i.e., 9.30 % per annum for every month of delay on the amount paid by the complainant from due date of possession i.e., 23.01.2017 till the offer of possession i.e., 13.06.2019 plus two months which comes out to be 13.08.2019 as per section 19 (10) of the Act.

ii. The arrears of interest accrued so far shall be paid to the complainant within 90 days from the date of this order.

iii. The complainant/allottee is directed to take possession as offer of possession letter dated 13.06.2019 after obtaining the OC from the competent authority has already been issued by the respondent promoter.

iv. The complainant is directed to pay outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment of interest for the delayed period. 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 the agreement. However, holding charges shall also not be charged by the promoter at any point of time even after being part of agreement as per law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in civil appeal no. 3864-3889/2020 dated 14.12.2020.

65. Complaint stands disposed of.

66. File be consigned to the registry.

(Samir Kumar)
Member

(Vijay Kumar Goyal)
Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 17.09.2021

JUDGEMENT UPLOADED ON 28.12.2021