

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

Complaint no. : 3692 of 2021  
Complaint filed on : 01.10.2021  
First date of hearing : 15.12.2021  
Date of decision : 18.02.2022

Shahab Rizvi  
R/o: Flat no.7012, Tower 5,  
Vipul Greens, Sohna Road,  
Gurugram-122018 Haryana, India.

**Complainant**

**Versus**

M/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd.  
Office: 306-308, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, Square One, C-2,  
District Centre, Saket, New Delhi-110017.

**Respondent**

**CORAM:**

Dr. K.K Khandelwal  
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal

**Chairman  
Member**

**APPEARANCE:**

Shri Jagdeep Kumar  
Shri Dhruv Rohatgi

Advocate for the complainant  
Advocate for the respondent

**ORDER**

1. The present complaint 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.

2. Since, the buyer's agreement has been executed on 22.04.2013 i.e. prior to the commencement of the Act *ibid*, therefore, the penal proceedings cannot be initiated retrospectively. Hence, the authority has decided to treat the present complaint as an application for non-compliance of statutory obligation on part of the promoter/respondent in terms of section 34(f) of the Act *ibid*.

**A. Project and unit related details**

3. The particulars of the project, the details of sale consideration, the amount paid by the 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	Gurgaon Greens, Sector 102, Gurugram, Haryana
2.	Project area	13.531 acres
3.	Nature of the project	Group housing colony
4.	DTCP license no. and validity status	75 of 2012 dated 31.07.2012 Valid/renewed up to 30.07.2020
5.	Name of licensee	Kamdhenu Projects Pvt. Ltd. and another C/o Emaar MGF Land Ltd.
6.	HRERA registered/ not registered	<b>Registered vide no. 36(a) of 2017 dated 05.12.2017 for 95829.92 sq. mtrs.</b>
	HRERA registration valid up to	31.12.2018
	HRERA extension of registration vide	<b>01 of 2019 dated 02.08.2019</b>
	Extension valid up to	31.12.2019

7.	Occupation certificate granted on	05.12.2018 [annexure R7, page 129 of reply]
8.	Allotment letter dated	25.01.2013 [annexure P1, page 32 of complaint]
9.	Unit no.	GGN-07-0101, 1 <sup>st</sup> floor, building no. 7 [annexure P2, page 47 of complaint]
10.	Unit measuring	1650 sq. ft. [Page 47 of complaint]
11.	Date of execution of buyer's agreement	22.04.2013 [annexure P2, page 44 of complaint]
12.	Payment plan	Construction linked payment plan [Page 75 of complaint]
13.	Total consideration as per statement of account dated 24.11.2021 at page 125 of reply	Rs. 1,22,97,616/-
14.	Total amount paid by the complainant as per statement of account dated 24.11.2021 at page 126 of reply	Rs.1,23,44,868/-
15.	Date of start of construction as per statement of account dated 24.11.2021 at page 125 of reply	14.06.2013
16.	Due date of delivery of possession as per clause 14(a) of the said agreement i.e. 36 months from the date of start of construction (14.06.2013) + grace period of 5 months, for applying and obtaining completion certificate/occupation certificate in respect of the unit and/or the project. [Page 60 of complaint]	14.06.2016 [Note: Grace period is not included]
17.	Date of offer of possession to the complainant	11.12.2018 [annexure R9, page 136 of reply]
18.	Unit handover dated	20.04.2019 [annexure R10, page 141 of reply]
19.	Conveyance deed executed on	02.05.2019 [annexure R11, page 147 of reply]

20.	Delay in handing over possession w.e.f. 14.06.2016 till 11.02.2019 i.e. date of offer of possession (11.12.2018) + 2 months	2 years 7 month 28 days
21.	Delay compensation already paid by the respondent in terms of the buyer's agreement as per statement of account dated 24.11.2021 at page 126 of reply	Rs.3,07,171/-

**B. Facts of the complaint**

4. The complainant made the following submissions in the complaint:

- i. That somewhere in the month of September 2012, the respondent through its business development associate approached the complainant with an offer to invest and buy a flat in the proposed project of respondent. On 05.09.2012, the complainant had a meeting with the respondent where the respondent explained the project details and highlighted the amenities of the project like joggers Park, Joggers Track, rose garden, 2 swimming pool, amphitheater and many more. Relying on these details, the complainant enquired about the availability of flat on 1<sup>st</sup> floor in tower 7 which was a unit consisting area of 1650 sq. ft. It was assured to the complainant that the respondent has already processed the file for all the necessary sanctions and approvals from the appropriate and concerned authorities for the development and completion of said project on time with the promised quality and specification. The respondent had also

shown the brochures and advertisement material of the said project to him and assured that the allotment letter and builder buyer agreement for the said project would be issued to him within one week of booking. The complainant, relying upon those assurances and believing them to be true, booked a residential flat bearing no. 0101 on 1<sup>st</sup> floor in tower no. 7 in the said project measuring approximately super area of 1650 sq. ft. Accordingly, they paid Rs. 7,50,000/- as booking amount on 05.09.2012.

- ii. That on 25.01.2013, approximately after 4 months, the respondent issued a provisional allotment letter containing very stringent and biased contractual terms which are illegal, arbitrary, unilateral and discriminatory in nature because every clause was drafted in a one-sided way and a single breach of unilateral terms of provisional allotment letter by complainant, will cost him forfeiture of 15% of total consideration value of unit. Respondent exceptionally increased the net consideration value of flat by adding EDC, IDC and PLC and when complainant opposed the unfair trade practices of respondent, they were informed that EDC, IDC and PLC are just the government levies, and they are as per the standard rules of government. Further, the delay payment charges will be imposed @ 24% which is standard rule of company and company will also compensate at the rate of Rs. 7.50/- per sq. ft. per month in case of delay in possession of flat by company.

Complainant opposed these illegal, arbitrary, unilateral and discriminatory terms of provisional allotment letter but there was no other option left with him because if he stops the further payment of installments then in that case, respondent may forfeit 15% of total consideration value from the total amount paid by the complainant. Thereafter, on 22.04.2013, the buyer's agreement was executed on similar illegal, arbitrary, unilateral and discriminatory terms narrated by respondent in provisional allotment letter.

- iii. That as per the clause 14 of the said buyer's agreement dated 22.04.2013, the respondent had agreed and promised to complete the construction of the said flat and deliver its possession within a period of 36 months with a five (5) months grace period thereon from the date of start of construction. The proposed possession date as per buyer's agreement was due on 14.06.2016. However, the respondent has breached the terms of said buyer's agreement and failed to fulfill its obligations and has not delivered possession of said flat within the agreed time frame of the buyer's agreement.
- iv. That from the date of booking 25.09.2012 and till 11.12.2018, the respondent had raised various demands for payment of installments towards sale consideration of the said flat and the complainant has duly paid and satisfied all those demands as agreed in the flat buyer's agreement without any default or delay

on their part and had also otherwise fulfilled their part of obligations as agreed in the flat buyer's agreement. The complainant was and has always been ready and willing to fulfill his part of agreement, if any pending.

- v. That as per Annexure-III (Schedule of Payments) of buyer's agreement, the sales consideration for the said flat was Rs.1,14,45,283/- (which includes the charges towards basic price of Rs.97,00,383/-; EDC & IDC of Rs. 5,70,900/-, club membership of Rs.50,000/-, IFMS of Rs.82,500/-, car park of Rs.3,00,000/- and PLC for 1<sup>st</sup> floor Rs.2,47,500/- and PLC for central greens of Rs.4,95,000/-) exclusive of service tax and GST. But later at the time of possession, the respondent added Rs.30,093/- in sale consideration and increased sale consideration to Rs.1,14,76,376/- without any reason for the same and the respondent also charged IFMS of Rs.82,500/- separately whereas IFMS charges were already included in sale consideration. That way the respondent charges IFMS twice from the residents. The respondent increased the sale consideration by Rs.1,12,593/- (Rs.30,093/- + Rs.82,500/-) without any reason which is illegal, arbitrary and unfair trade practice.
- vi. That as per the statement dated 05.08.2021, issued by the respondent, the complainant has already paid Rs.1,20,80,306/- towards total sale consideration and applicable taxes as demanded

by the respondent from time to time and now nothing is pending to be paid on the part of complainant. Although, the respondent charged Rs.1,12,593/- extra from the complainant.

vii. That the possession was offered by respondent through letter "Intimation of Possession" dated 11.12.2018 which was not a valid offer of possession because respondent had offered the possession with stringent condition to pay certain amounts which were never part of agreement. At the time of offer of possession, builder did not adjust the delay penalty for delayed possession. Respondent demanded Rs.1,44,540/- towards two-year advance maintenance charges from complainant which was never agreed under the buyer's agreement and respondent also demanded a lien marked FD of Rs.3,53,451/- on pretext of future liability against HVAT which are also unfair trade practice. The respondent demanded Rs.5,37,150/- towards e-stamp duty and Rs.50,000/- towards registration charges of above said unit in addition to final demand raised by respondent along with offer of possession. The respondent gave physical handover of aforesaid property on 20.04.2019.

viii. That after taking possession of flat on 20.04.2019, the complainant also identified some major structural changes which were done by respondent in project in comparison to features of project narrated to them on 25.09.2012 at the office of respondent. The area of the



central park was told 8 acres but in reality, it is very small as compared to 8 acres; respondent-built car parking underneath 'Central Park', respondent charged PLC from the complainant on the pretext of Central Park. Respondent did many structural changes and cut down on the internal features of the project based on which the respondent sold this flat to the complainant and other buyers of this project.

- ix. That on 20.04.2019, the complainant telephonically informed the respondent that the respondent is creating anomaly by not compensating the complainant for delay possession charges at the rate of interest specified as per the Act. The complainant made it clear to the respondent that if it does not compensate the complainant at the same rate of interest then the complainant will approach the appropriate forum to get redressal.
- x. That the respondent has acted in a very deficient, unfair, wrongful, fraudulent manner by not delivering the said flat within the agreed timelines as agreed in the buyer's agreement and otherwise. That on 20.04.2019, there has been total delay of 2 years and 10 months. The cause of action accrued in the favour of the complainant and against the respondent on 05.09.2012 when the said flat was booked by the complainant, and it further arose when respondent failed/neglected to deliver the said flat on proposed delivery date.

The cause of action is continuing and is still subsisting on day-to-day basis.

**C. Relief sought by the complainant**

5. The complainant is seeking the following relief:

- i. Direct the respondent to pay interest at the rate of 18% on account of delay in offering possession on the amount paid by the complainant as sale consideration of the said flat from the date of payment till the date of delivery of possession.
- ii. Direct the respondent to return Rs.1,12,593/- unreasonably charged by the respondent by increasing sale price after execution of buyer's agreement between the respondent and the complainant.
- iii. Direct the respondent to charge maintenance in accordance with the buyer's agreement and furnish the records and details of maintenance calculations with the respondent.
- iv. Direct the respondent to return entire amount paid as GST.
- v. Direct the respondent to issue necessary instructions to the complainant's bank to remove lien marked over FD of Rs.3,53,451/- in favour of the respondent on the pretext of future payment of HVAT for the period 01.04.2014 to 30.06.2017.
- vi. Direct the respondent to return entire amount of Rs.26,4045/- paid as holding charges by the complainant.
- vii. Direct the respondent to charge electricity charges in accordance with the consumption of units by complainant and restrain the

respondent from charging fixed minimum charges on electricity meters.

- viii. Any other relief/order or direction which this hon'ble authority may deems fit and proper considering the facts and circumstances of the present complaint.

**D. Reply filed by the respondent**

6. The respondent had contested the complaint on the following grounds:
- i. That present complaint is based on an erroneous interpretation of the provisions of the Act as well as an incorrect understanding of the terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement dated 22.04.2013. That the provisions of the Act are not retrospective in nature. The provisions of the Act cannot undo or modify the terms of an agreement duly executed prior to coming into effect of the Act. It is further submitted that merely because the Act applies to ongoing projects which are registered with the authority, the Act cannot be said to be operating retrospectively. The provisions of the Act relied upon by the complainant for seeking interest cannot be called in to aid in derogation and ignorance of the provisions of the buyer's agreement. The interest is compensatory in nature and cannot be granted in derogation and ignorance of the provisions of the buyer's agreement. It is further submitted that the interest for the alleged delay demanded by the complainant is beyond the scope of the buyer's agreement. The complainant cannot demand any interest or compensation beyond the terms and conditions incorporated in the buyer's agreement.

- ii. That the complainant vide an application form applied to the respondent for provisional allotment of a unit in the project. The complainant, in pursuance of the application form, were allotted an independent unit bearing no. GGN-07-0101, located on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor, in the project vide provisional allotment letter dated 25.01.2013. The complainant consciously and willfully opted for a construction linked plan for remittance of the sale consideration for the unit in question and further represented to the respondent that he shall remit every installment on time as per the payment schedule. The respondent had no reason to suspect the bonafide of the complainant and proceeded to allot the unit in question in his favor.
- iii. That thereafter, buyer's agreement dated 22.04.2013 was executed between the complainant and the respondent. The complainant was irregular in payment of instalments. The respondent was constrained to issue reminders and letters to the complainant requesting him to make payment of demanded amounts. Payment request letters, reminders etc., had been got sent to the complainant by the respondent clearly mentioning the amount that was outstanding and the due date for remittance of the respective amounts as per the schedule of payments, requesting the complainant to timely discharge their outstanding financial liability but to no avail. Statement of account dated 24.11.2021 as maintained by the respondent in due course of its business depicts the delay in remittance of various payments by the complainant.

- iv. That the complainant consciously and maliciously chose to ignore the payment request letters and reminders issued by the respondent and flouted in making timely payments of the instalments which was an essential, crucial and an indispensable requirement under the buyer's agreement. Furthermore, when the proposed allottees default in their payments as per schedule agreed upon, the failure has a cascading effect on the operations and the cost for proper execution of the project increases exponentially and further causes enormous business losses to the respondent. The complainant chose to ignore all these aspects and wilfully defaulted in making timely payments. It is submitted that the respondent despite defaults of several allottees earnestly fulfilled its obligations under the buyer's agreement and completed the project as expeditiously as possible in the facts and circumstances of the case. Therefore, there is no equity in favour of the complainant.
- v. That clause 14(b)(v) of the buyer's agreement provides that in the event of any default or delay in payment of instalments as per the schedule of payments incorporated in the buyer's agreement, the time for delivery of possession shall also stand extended. Further clause 16 of the buyer's agreement provides that the compensation for delay in delivery of possession shall only be given to such allottees who are not in default of their obligations as envisaged under the agreement and who have not defaulted in payment of instalments as per the payment plan incorporated in the agreement. It is submitted that the complainant has defaulted in

timely remittance of the instalments and hence the date of delivery option is not liable to be determined in the manner sought to be done by the complainant. The complainant is conscious and aware of the said agreement and has filed the present complaint to harass the respondent and compel the respondent to surrender to their illegal demands. It is submitted that the filing of the present complaint is nothing but an abuse of the process of law.

- vi. That despite there being a number of defaulters in the project, the respondent itself infused funds into the project and has diligently developed the project in question. The respondent had applied for occupation certificate on 13.04.2018. The occupation certificate was thereafter issued in favour of the respondent vide memo bearing no. ZP-835/AD(RA)/2018/33193 dated 05.12.2018. It is pertinent to note that once an application for grant of occupation certificate is submitted for approval in the office of the concerned statutory authority, the respondent ceases to have any control over the same. The grant of sanction of the occupation certificate is the prerogative of the concerned statutory authority over which the respondent cannot exercise any influence. As far as the respondent is concerned, it has diligently and sincerely pursued the matter with the concerned statutory authority for obtaining of the occupation certificate. No fault or lapse can be attributed to the respondent in the facts and circumstances of the case. Therefore, the time period utilised by the statutory authority to grant occupation certificate to the respondent is necessarily required to

be excluded from computation of the time period utilised for implementation and development of the project.

- vii. That the construction of the project/allotted unit in question already stands completed and the respondent has already offered possession of the unit in question to the complainant. Furthermore, the project of the respondent has been registered under the Act and the rules. Registration certificate was granted by the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority vide memo no. HRERA-139/2017/2294 dated 05.12.2017. That the respondent had applied for extension of the registration and the validity of the registration certificate was extended till 31.12.2019 vide extension certificate dated 02.08.2019.
- viii. That the complainant was offered possession of the unit in question through letter of offer of possession dated 11.12.2018. The complainant was called upon to remit balance payment including delayed payment charges and to complete the necessary formalities/documentation necessary for handover of the unit in question to the complainant. However, the complainant approached the respondent with request for payment of compensation for the alleged delay in utter disregard of the terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement. The respondent explained to the complainant that they are not entitled to any compensation in terms of the buyer's agreement on account of default in timely remittance of instalments as per schedule of payment incorporated in the buyer's agreement. The respondent earnestly requested the complainant to obtain possession of the

unit in question and further requested the complainant to execute a conveyance deed in respect of the unit in question after completing all the formalities regarding delivery of possession. However, the complainant did not pay any heed to the legitimate, just and fair requests of the respondent and threatened the respondent with institution of unwarranted litigation.

ix. That the respondent, in order to settle the unwarranted controversy needlessly instigated by the complainant, proceeded to credit an amount of Rs.3,07,171/- to the account of the complainant in full and final satisfaction of his alleged grievances. Moreover, the respondent has also credited a sum of Rs.72,507/- as benefit on account of anti-profiting. Without prejudice to the rights of the respondent, delayed interest if any has to be calculated only on the amounts deposited by the allottees/complainant towards the basic principle amount of the unit in question and not on any amount credited by the respondent, or any payment made by the allottees/complainant towards delayed payment charges or any taxes/statutory payments etc.

x. That after receipt of the aforesaid amount, the complainant approached the respondent requesting it to deliver the possession of the unit in question. A unit handover letter dated 20.04.2019 was executed by the complainant, specifically and expressly agreeing that the liabilities and obligations of the respondent as enumerated in the allotment letter or the buyer's agreement stand satisfied. No cause of action has arisen or subsists in favour of the complainant to institute or prosecute the instant complaint.



- xi. That after execution of the unit handover letter dated 20.04.2019 and obtaining of possession of the unit in question, the complainant is left with no right, entitlement or claim against the respondent. It needs to be highlighted that the complainant has further executed a conveyance deed dated 02.05.2019 in respect of the unit in question. The transaction between the complainant and the respondent stands concluded and no right or liability can be asserted by the respondent or the complainant against the other. It is pertinent to take into reckoning that the complainant has obtained possession of the unit in question and have executed conveyance deed in respect thereof. The instant complaint is a gross misuse of process of law.
- xii. That several allottees, including the complainant, have defaulted in timely remittance of payment of installments which was an essential, crucial and an indispensable requirement for conceptualisation and development of the project in question. Furthermore, when the proposed allottees default in their payments as per schedule agreed upon, the failure has a cascading effect on the operations and the cost for proper execution of the project increases exponentially whereas enormous business losses befall upon the respondent. The respondent, despite default of several allottees, has diligently and earnestly pursued the development of the project in question and has constructed the project in question as expeditiously as possible. It is submitted that the construction of the tower in which the unit in question is situated is complete and the respondent has already offered

possession of the unit in question to the complainant. Therefore, there is no default or lapse on the part of the respondent and there is no equity in favour of the complainant. Thus, it is most respectfully submitted that the present application deserves to be dismissed at the very threshold.

**E. Jurisdiction of the authority**

7. The authority observed that it has territorial as well as subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint for the reasons given below.

**E.I Territorial jurisdiction**

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

**E.II Subject-matter jurisdiction**

9. Section 11(4)(a) of the Act 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) *The promoter shall-*

- (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;*

**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.*

10. 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 as per provisions of section 11(4)(a) of the Act leaving aside compensation which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer if pursued by the complainant at a later stage.

**F. Findings on the objections raised by the respondent**

**F.I Objection regarding jurisdiction of authority w.r.t. buyer's agreement executed prior to coming into force of the Act and provisions of the Act are not retrospective in nature**

11. The respondent raised an objection that the provisions of the Act are not retrospective in nature and the provisions of the Act cannot undo or modify the terms of an agreement duly executed prior to coming into force of the Act. The authority is of the view that the Act nowhere provides, nor can be so construed, that all previous agreements will be re-written after coming into force of the Act. Therefore, the provisions of the Act, rules and agreement have to be read and interpreted harmoniously. However, if the Act has provided for dealing with certain

specific provisions/ situation in a specific/particular manner, then that situation will be dealt with in accordance with the Act and the rules after the date of coming into force of the Act and the rules. Numerous provisions of the Act save the provisions of the agreements made between the buyers and sellers. The said contention has been upheld in the landmark judgment of *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."

12. 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."*

13. The agreements are sacrosanct save and except for the provisions which have been abrogated by the Act itself. Further, it is noted that the builder-buyer agreements have been executed in the manner that there is no scope left to the allottee to negotiate any of the clauses contained therein. Therefore, the authority is of the view that the charges payable under various heads shall be payable as per the agreed terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement subject to the condition that the same are in accordance with the plans/permissions approved by the respective departments/competent authorities and are not in contravention of the Act, rules and regulations made thereunder and are not unreasonable or exorbitant in nature.

**F.II Objection regarding exclusion of time taken by the competent authority in processing the application and issuance of occupation certificate**

14. As far as contention of the respondent with respect to the exclusion of time taken by the competent authority in processing the application and issuance of occupation certificate is concerned, the authority observed that the respondent had applied for grant of occupation certificate on 13.04.2018 and thereafter vide memo no. ZP-835-AD(RA)/2018/33193 dated 05.12.2018, the occupation certificate has been granted by the competent authority under the prevailing law. The

authority cannot be a silent spectator to the deficiency in the application submitted by the promoter for issuance of occupancy certificate. It is evident from the occupation certificate dated 05.12.2018 that an incomplete application for grant of OC was applied on 13.04.2018 as fire NOC from the competent authority was granted only on 21.11.2018 which is subsequent to the filing of application for occupation certificate. Also, the Chief Engineer-I, HSVP, Panchkula has submitted his requisite report in respect of the said project on 11.10.2018. The District Town Planner, Gurugram and Senior Town Planner, Gurugram has submitted requisite report about this project on 31.10.2018 and 02.11.2018 respectively. As such, the application submitted on 13.04.2018 was incomplete and an incomplete application is no application in the eyes of law.

15. The application for issuance of occupancy certificate shall be moved in the prescribed forms and accompanied by the documents mentioned in sub-code 4.10.1 of the Haryana Building Code, 2017. As per sub-code 4.10.4 of the said Code, after receipt of application for grant of occupancy certificate, the competent authority shall communicate in writing within 60 days, its decision for grant/ refusal of such permission for occupation of the building in Form BR-VII. In the present case, the respondent has completed its application for occupancy certificate only on 21.11.2018 and consequently the concerned authority has granted occupancy certificate on 05.12.2018. Therefore, in view of the

deficiency in the said application dated 13.04.2018 and aforesaid reasons, no delay in granting occupation certificate can be attributed to the concerned statutory authority.

**F.III Whether signing of unit hand over letter or indemnity-cum-undertaking at the time of possession extinguishes the right of the allottee to claim delay possession charges.**

16. The respondent contended that at the time of taking possession of the subject flat vide unit hand over letter dated 20.04.2019, the complainant had certified himself to be fully satisfied with regard to the measurements, location, direction, developments et cetera of the unit and also admitted and acknowledge that he does not have any claim of any nature whatsoever against the respondent and that upon acceptance of possession, the liabilities and obligations of the respondent as enumerated in the allotment letter/buyer's agreement, stand fully satisfied. The relevant para of the unit handover letter relied upon reads as under:

*"The Allottee, hereby, certifies that he / she has taken over the peaceful and vacant physical possession of the aforesaid Unit after fully satisfying himself / herself with regard to its measurements, location, dimension and development etc. and hereafter the Allottee has no claim of any nature whatsoever against the Company with regard to the size, dimension, area, location and legal status of the aforesaid Home.*

*Upon acceptance of possession, the liabilities and obligations of the Company as enumerated in the allotment letter/Agreement executed in favour of the Allottee stand satisfied."*

17. In the complaint bearing no. **4031 of 2019** titled as **Varun Gupta V/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd.**, the authority has comprehensively dealt with this issue and has held that the aforesaid unit handover letter does not

preclude the complainant from exercising their right to claim delay possession charges as per the provisions of the Act. In light of the aforesaid order, the complainant is entitled to delay possession charges as per provisions of the Act despite signing of indemnity at the time of possession or unit handover letter.

**F.IV Whether the execution of the conveyance deed extinguishes the right of the allottee to claim delay possession charges**

18. The respondent submitted that the complainant has executed the conveyance deed on 02.05.2019 and therefore, the transaction between the complainant and the respondent have been concluded and no right or liability can be asserted by respondent or the complainant against the other. Therefore, the complainant is estopped from claiming any interest in the facts and circumstances of the case. The present complaint is nothing but a gross misuse of process of law.
19. In the complaint bearing no. **4031 of 2019** titled as **Varun Gupta V/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd.**, the authority has comprehensively dealt with this issue and has held that taking over the possession and thereafter execution of the conveyance deed can best be termed as respondent having discharged its liabilities as per the buyer's agreement and upon taking possession, and/or executing conveyance deed, the complainant never gave up their statutory right to seek delayed possession charges as per the provisions of the said Act. Also, the same view has been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as **Wg. Cdr. Arifur**



**Rahman Khan and Aleya Sultana and Ors. Vs. DLF Southern Homes Pvt. Ltd. (now Known as BEGUR OMR Homes Pvt. Ltd.) and Ors. (Civil appeal no. 6239 of 2019) dated 24.08.2020, the relevant paras are reproduced herein below:**

- "34 The developer has not disputed these communications. Though these are four communications issued by the developer, the appellants submitted that they are not isolated aberrations but fit into a pattern. The developer does not state that it was willing to offer the flat purchasers possession of their flats and the right to execute conveyance of the flats while reserving their claim for compensation for delay. On the contrary, the tenor of the communications indicates that while executing the Deeds of Conveyance, the flat buyers were informed that no form of protest or reservation would be acceptable. The flat buyers were essentially presented with an unfair choice of either retaining their right to pursue their claims (in which event they would not get possession or title in the meantime) or to forsake the claims in order to perfect their title to the flats for which they had paid valuable consideration. In this backdrop, the simple question which we need to address is whether a flat buyer who seeks to espouse a claim against the developer for delayed possession can as a consequence of doing so be compelled to defer the right to obtain a conveyance to perfect their title. It would, in our view, be manifestly unreasonable to expect that in order to pursue a claim for compensation for delayed handing over of possession, the purchaser must indefinitely defer obtaining a conveyance of the premises purchased or, if they seek to obtain a Deed of Conveyance to forsake the right to claim compensation. This basically is a position which the NCDRC has espoused. We cannot countenance that view.*
35. *The flat purchasers invested hard earned money. It is only reasonable to presume that the next logical step is for the purchaser to perfect the title to the premises which have been allotted under the terms of the ABA. But the submission of the developer is that the purchaser forsakes the remedy before the consumer forum by seeking a Deed of Conveyance. To accept such a construction would lead to an absurd consequence of requiring the purchaser either to abandon a just claim as a condition for obtaining the conveyance or to indefinitely delay the execution of the Deed of Conveyance pending protracted consumer litigation."*

20. Therefore, in furtherance of *Varun Gupta V/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd. (supra)* and the law laid down by the hon'ble Apex Court in the **Wg. Cdr. Arifur Rahman (supra)**, this authority holds that even after execution of the conveyance deed, the complainant cannot be precluded from their right to seek delay possession charges from the respondent-promoter.

**G. Findings of the authority**

**G.I Delay possession charges**

21. **Relief sought by the complainant:** Direct the respondent to pay interest at the rate of 18% on account of delay in offering possession on the amount paid by the complainant as sale consideration of the said flat from the date of payment till the date of delivery of possession.
22. 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***

***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."*

23. Clause 14(a) of the buyer's agreement provides time period for handing over the possession and the same is reproduced below:

**"14. POSSESSION**

**(a) Time of handing over the Possession**

*Subject to terms of this clause and barring force majeure conditions, and subject to the Allottee having complied with all the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and not being in default under any of the provisions of this Agreement and compliance with all provisions, formalities, documentation etc., as prescribed by the Company. The Company proposes to hand over the possession of the Unit within 36 (Thirty Six) months from the date of start of construction, subject to timely compliance of the provisions of the Agreement by the Allottee. The Allottee agrees and understands that the Company shall be entitled to a grace period of 5 (five) months, for applying and obtaining the completion certificate/occupation certificate in respect of the Unit and/or the Project."*

24. At the outset, it is relevant to comment on the preset possession clause of the agreement wherein the possession has been subjected to all kinds of terms and conditions of this agreement, and the complainant not being in default under any provisions of this agreement and compliance with all provisions, formalities and documentation as prescribed by the promoter. The drafting of this clause and incorporation of such conditions are not only vague and uncertain but so heavily loaded in favour of the promoter and against the allottee that even a single default by the allottee in fulfilling formalities and documentations etc. as prescribed by the promoter may make the possession clause irrelevant for the purpose of allottee and the commitment time period for handing over possession loses its meaning. The incorporation of such clause in the buyer's agreement by the promoter is just to evade the liability towards timely delivery of subject unit and to deprive the allottees of their 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.

**25. Due date of handing over possession and admissibility of grace**

**period:** The promoter has proposed to hand over the possession of the said unit within 36 (thirty-six) months from the date of start of construction and further provided in agreement that promoter shall be entitled to a grace period of 5 months for applying and obtaining completion certificate/occupation certificate in respect of said unit. The date of start of construction is 14.06.2013 as per statement of account dated 24.11.2021. The period of 36 months expired on 14.06.2016. As a matter of fact, the promoter has not applied to the concerned authority for obtaining completion certificate/ occupation certificate within the time limit (36 months) prescribed by the promoter in the buyer's agreement. The promoter has moved the application for issuance of occupation certificate only on 13.04.2018 when the period of 36 months has already expired. As per the settled law one cannot be allowed to take advantage of his own wrong. Accordingly, the benefit of grace period of 5 months cannot be allowed to the promoter at this stage. Therefore, the due date of handing over possession comes out to be 14.06.2013.

**26. Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of**

**interest:** The complainant is seeking delay possession charges at the

18% rate of interest. 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.*

27. The legislature in its wisdom in the subordinate legislation under 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.
28. Taking the case from another angle, the complainant-allottee was entitled to the delayed possession charges/interest only at the rate of Rs.7.50/- per sq. ft. per month of the super area as per clause 16 of the buyer's agreement for the period of such delay; whereas, as per clause 13 of the buyer's agreement, the promoter was entitled to interest @ 24% per annum at the time of every succeeding instalment from the due date of instalment till date of payment on account for the delayed

payments by the allottee. The functions of the authority are to safeguard the interest of the aggrieved person, may be the allottee or the promoter. The rights of the parties are to be balanced and must be equitable. The promoter cannot be allowed to take undue advantage of his dominant position and to exploit the needs of the home buyers. This authority is duty bound to take into consideration the legislative intent i.e., to protect the interest of the consumers/allottees in the real estate sector. The clauses of the buyer's agreement entered into between the parties are one-sided, unfair and unreasonable with respect to the grant of interest for delayed possession. There are various other clauses in the buyer's agreement which give sweeping powers to the promoter to cancel the allotment and forfeit the amount paid. Thus, the terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement are ex-facie one-sided, unfair and unreasonable, and the same shall constitute the unfair trade practice on the part of the promoter. These types of discriminatory terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement will not be final and binding.

29. 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., 18.02.2022 is 7.30%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be MCLR +2% i.e., 9.30%.
30. **Rate of interest to be paid by the complainant in case of delay in making payments-** 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:

*"(2a) "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;"*

31. 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.
32. On consideration of the documents available on record and submissions made by the parties regarding contravention as per provisions of the Act, the authority is satisfied that the respondent is in contravention of the section 11(4)(a) of the Act by not handing over possession by the due date as per the agreement. By virtue of clause 14(a) of the buyer's agreement executed between the parties on 22.04.2013, the possession of the subject flat was to be delivered within a period of 36 months from the date of start of construction plus 5 months grace period for applying and obtaining the completion certificate/ occupation certificate in

respect of the unit and/or the project. The construction was started on 14.06.2013. As far as grace period is concerned, the same is disallowed for the reasons quoted above. Therefore, the due date of handing over possession comes out to be 14.06.2016. Occupation certificate was granted by the concerned authority on 05.12.2018 and thereafter, the possession of the subject flat was offered to the complainant on 11.12.2018. Copies of the same have been placed on record. Thereafter, the complainant had taken possession of the subject unit vide unit handover letter dated 20.04.2019 and subsequently, the conveyance deed was executed on 02.05.2019. The authority in complaint bearing no. **4031 of 2019** titled as *Varun Gupta V/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd.* has comprehensively decided that the execution of conveyance deed/unit handover letter between the parties does not waive/extinguish the allottee/complainant right to delay possession charges under section 18(1) of the Act. The authority is of the considered view that there is delay on the part of the respondent to offer physical possession of the subject flat to the complainant as per the terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement dated 22.04.2013 executed between the parties. It is the failure on part of the promoter to fulfil its obligations and responsibilities as per the buyer's agreement dated 22.04.2013 to hand over the possession within the stipulated period.

33. Section 19(10) of the Act obligate 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 05.12.2018. The respondent offered the possession of the unit in question to the complainant only on 11.12.2018, 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. These 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. 14.06.2016 till the expiry of 2 months from the date of offer of possession (11.12.2018) which comes out to be 11.02.2019.

34. Accordingly, the non-compliance of the mandate contained in section 11(4)(a) read with section 18(1) of the Act on the part of the respondent is established. As such the complainant is entitled to delayed possession at prescribed rate of interest i.e. 9.30% p.a. w.e.f. 14.06.2016 till 11.02.2019 as per provisions of section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules.

35. Also, the amount of Rs.3,07,171/- (as per statement of account dated 24.11.2021) so paid by the respondent to the complainant towards compensation for delay in handing over possession shall be adjusted towards the delay possession charges to be paid by the respondent in terms of proviso to section 18(1) of the Act.

**G.II Increase in sale price**

36. **Relief sought by the complainant:** Direct the respondent to return

claimed by the complainant and denied that IFMS has been charged twice.

39. the complaint bearing no. **4031 of 2019** titled as **Varun Gupta V/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd.**, the authority has held that a nominal amount of up to Rs.15000/- may be charged by the promoter for administrative/registration charges which it may have incurred for facilitating the transfer of the subject unit as has been fixed by the DTP office in this regard and for any other charges like incidental and of like nature, since the same are not defined and no quantum is specified in the builder buyer's agreement, therefore, the same cannot be charged. In light of the aforesaid judgement, the respondent is directed not to charge any amount under the head 'other charges' or 'miscellaneous expenditure' and is directed to delete the said amount from the total sale consideration.

### **G.III Advance maintenance charges**

40. **Relief sought by the complainant:** Direct the respondent to charge maintenance in accordance with the buyer's agreement and furnish the records and details of maintenance calculation's with complainant.
41. The authority has decided this issue in the complaint bearing no. **4031 of 2019** titled as **Varun Gupta V/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd.** wherein the authority has held that the respondent is right in demanding advance maintenance charges at the rates' prescribed in the builder buyer's

agreement at the time of offer of possession. However, the respondent shall not demand the advance maintenance charges for more than one year from the allottee even in those cases wherein no specific clause has been prescribed in the agreement or where the AMC has been demanded for more than a year.

42. In the present complaint, as per clause 21 of the buyer's agreement, following provisions has been made with respect to the advance maintenance charges:

**"21. MAINTENANCE**

- (a) *The Allottee hereby agrees and undertakes to enter into a separate Maintenance Agreement as per the draft provided as Annexure-IX to this Agreement with the Maintenance Agency.*
- (b) *The Allottee further agrees and undertakes to pay the Maintenance Charges as may be levied by the Maintenance Agency for the upkeep and maintenance of the Project, its common areas, utilities, equipment installed in the Building and such other facilities forming part of the Project. Further, the Allottee agrees and undertakes to pay in advance, along with the last installment specified under Payment Plan, advance maintenance charge (AMC) equivalent to Maintenance Charges for a period of one year or as may be decided by the Company / Maintenance Agency at its discretion. Such charges payable by the Allottee will be subject to escalation of such costs and expenses as may be levied by the Maintenance Agency. The Company reserves the right to change, modify, amend and impose additional conditions in the Tripartite Maintenance Agreement at its sole discretion from time to time."*  
*(Emphasis supplied)*

43. In the present complaint, the respondent has demanded Rs.1,44,540/- towards advance maintenance charges (@ Rs.3.65 per sq. ft.) for period of 24 months as per letter of offer of possession dated 11.12.2018. Keeping in view the facts above, the authority holds that the respondent

is right in demanding advance maintenance charges at the rate prescribed therein at the time of offer of possession in view of the judgement (supra). However, the respondent shall not demand the advance maintenance charges for more than one (1) year from the complainant.

#### **G.IV GST**

44. **Relief sought by the complainant:** Direct the respondent to return entire amount paid as GST.
45. The complainant submitted that GST came into force on 01.07.2017 and the possession was supposed to be delivered by 14.06.2016. Therefore, the tax which has come into existence after the due date of possession and this extra cost should not be levied on complainant. On the contrary, the respondent denied that any amount towards GST is liable to be returned to the complainant.
46. The authority has decided this issue in the complaint bearing no. **4031 of 2019** titled as *Varun Gupta V/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd.* wherein the authority has held that for the projects where the due date of possession was prior to 01.07.2017 (date of coming into force of GST), the respondent/promoter is not entitled to charge any amount towards GST from the complainant/allottee as the liability of that charge had not become due up to the due date of possession as per the buyer's agreements.

47. In the present complaint, the possession of the subject unit was required to be delivered by 14.06.2016 and the incidence of GST came into operation thereafter on 01.07.2017. So, the complainant cannot be burdened to discharge a liability which had accrued solely due to respondents' own fault in delivering timely possession of the subject unit. So, the respondent/promoter is not entitled to charge GST from the complainant/allottee as the liability of GST had not become due up to the due date of possession as per the said agreement.

#### **G.V HVAT**

48. **Relief sought by the complainant:** Direct the respondent to issue necessary instructions to the complainant's bank to remove lien marked over FD of Rs.3,53,451/- in favour of the respondent on the pretext of future payment of HVAT for the period 01.04.2014 to 30.06.2017.

49. The authority has decided this in the complaint bearing no. **4031 of 2019** titled as **Varun Gupta V/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd.** wherein the authority has held that the promoter is entitled to charge VAT from the allottee for the period up to 31.03.2014 @ 1.05% (one percent VAT + 5 percent surcharge on VAT). However, the promoter cannot charge any VAT from the allottees/prospective buyers for the period 01.04.2014 to 30.06.2017 as the same was to be borne by the promoter-developer only. The respondent-promoter is bound to adjust the said amount, if

charged from the allottee with the dues payable by him or refund the amount if no dues are payable by him.

50. In the present complaint, the respondent vide letter of offer of possession dated 11.12.2018 has demanded lien marked FD of Rs. 3,53,451/- towards future liability of HVAT for liability post 01.04.2014. In light of judgement stated above, the respondent shall not demand the same and the lien so marked be removed. Also, information about the same be sent to the concerned bank by the promoter as well as complainant along with the copy of this order.

#### **G.VI Holding charges**

51. **Relief sought by the complainant:** Direct the respondent to return entire amount of Rs.26,405/- paid as holding charges by the complainant.
52. The authority has decided this in the complaint bearing no. **4031 of 2019** titled as *Varun Gupta V/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd.* wherein the authority has held that the respondent is not entitled to claim holding charges from the complainant/allottee at any point of time even after being part of the buyer's agreement as per law settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in civil appeal nos. 3864-3889/2020 decided on 14.12.2020. Therefore, in light of the above, the respondent is not entitled to demand holding charges though it would be entitled to interest for the period the payment is delayed.

**G.VII Electricity charges**

53. **Relief sought by the complainant:** Direct the respondent to charge electricity charges in accordance with consumption of units by complainant and restrain the respondent from charging fixed minimum charges on electricity meters.
54. With respect to the aforesaid relief sought by the complainant, the counsel for the complainant has not pressed them at the time of arguments. Therefore, the authority has not deliberated on the said relief.

**H. Directions of the authority**

55. Hence, the authority hereby passes this order and issues the following directions under section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance of obligations cast upon the promoter as per the function entrusted to the authority under section 34(f):
- 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. 14.06.2016 till 11.02.2019 i.e. expiry of 2 months from the date of offer of possession (11.12.2018). 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. Also, the amount of Rs.3,07,171/- so paid by the respondent towards compensation for delay in handing over possession shall be adjusted towards the delay possession charges to be paid by the respondent in terms of proviso to section 18(1) of the Act.
- iii. The respondent is directed not to charge any amount under the head 'other charges' or 'miscellaneous expenditure' and is directed to delete the said amount from the total sale consideration.
- iv. The respondent shall not demand the advance maintenance charges for more than one (1) year from the allottee.
- v. The respondent shall not charge GST from the complainant as the liability of GST had not become due up to the due date of possession as per the said agreement.
- vi. The respondent cannot charge any HVAT from the allottees/prospective buyers for the period 01.04.2014 to 30.06.2017 as the same was to be borne by the promoter-developer only. Therefore, the respondent shall not demand the same and the lien so marked be removed. Information about the same be also sent to the concerned bank by the promoter as well as complainant along with copy of this order.
- vii. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainant which is not the part of the buyer's agreement. The respondent is also not entitled to claim holding charges from the

complainant/allottee at any point of time even after being part of the buyer's agreement as per law settled by hon'ble Supreme Court in civil appeal nos. 3864-3889/2020 decided on 14.12.2020.

56. Complaint stands disposed of.


57. File be consigned to registry.

  
(Vijay Kumar Goyal)  
Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 18.02.2022

Order uploaded on 16.03.2022.

  
(Dr. K.K. Khandelwal)  
Chairman