BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, GURUGRAM

Complaint no. : 825 of 2021
First date of hearing: 04.05.2021
Date of decision : 10.02.2022

1. Abeda Khan
2. Sajid Khan

Both RR/o: Lex Alliance, A-414, LGF Defence Colony, New Delhi- 110024 **Complainants**

Versus

Athena Infrastructure Limited
Regd. office: M-62 & 63, 1st floor, Connaught Place, New Delhi-110001 **Respondent**

CORAM:
Dr. KK Khandelwal **Chairman**
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal **Member**

APPEARANCE:
Smt. Medhya Ahluwalia Advocate for the complainants
Shri Rahul Yadav Advocate for the respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated 17.02.2021 has been filed by the complainants/allottees in Form CRA under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (in short, the Act) read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (in short, the Rules) for violation of section 11(4)(a) of the Act wherein it is inter alia prescribed that the promoter shall be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions to the allottee as per the agreement for sale executed inter-se them.

A. Unit and Project related details:

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

S. No.	Heads	Information
1.	Name and location of the project	"Indiabulls Enigma", Sector 110, Gurugram
2.	Nature of the project	Residential complex
3.	Project area	15.6 acres
4.	DTCP License	213 of 2007 dated 05.09.2007 valid till 04.09.2024 10 of 2011 dated 29.01.2011 valid till 28.01.2023
	Name of the licensee	M/s Athena Infrastructure Private Limited
		64 of 2012 dated 20.06.2012 valid till 19.06.2023
	Name of the licensee	Varali properties
5.	HRERA registered/ not registered	**Registered vide no.** **i. 351 of 2017 dated 20.11.2017 valid till 31.08.2018** **ii. 354 of 2017 dated 17.11.2017 valid till 30.09.2018** **iii. 353 of 2017 dated 20.11.2017 valid till 31.03.2018** **iv. 346 of 2017 dated 08.11.2017 valid till 31.08.2018**
6.	Date of execution of flat buyer's agreement	**04.01.2012** (As per page no. 38 of complaint)
7.	Unit no.	J- 061 on 6th floor, tower J (As per page no. 42 of the complaint)
8.	Super Area	3880 sq. ft. (As per page no. 42 of the complaint)

9.	Payment plan	Construction linked payment plan (As per page 55 of the complaint)
10.	Total consideration	Rs. 2,33,90,600/- (As per applicant ledger dated 09.05.2019 on page no. 62 of complaint)
11.	Total amount paid by the complainants	Rs. 2,42,91,427/- (As per applicant ledger dated 09.05.2019 on page no. 62 of complaint)
12.	Due date of delivery of possession (As per ***clause 21 of the agreement***: *The Developer shall endeavour to complete the construction of the said building /Unit* ***within a period of three years, with a six months grace period thereon from the date of execution of the Flat Buyers Agreement*** *subject to timely payment by the Buyer(s) of Total Sale Price payable according to the Payment Plan applicable to him or as demanded by the Developer. The Developer on completion of the construction /development shall issue final call notice to the Buyer, who shall within 60 days thereof, remit all dues and take possession of the Unit*)	04.07.2015 (Calculated from the date of the agreement i.e.; 04.01.2012 + grace period of 6 months) **(Grace period of 6 months is allowed)**
13.	Endorsement dated	28.06.2017 (As per page no. 60 of the complaint)
14.	Add- on endorsement dated	08.11.2017 (As per page no. 61 of complaint)
15.	Occupation Certificate	17.09.2018 (As per page no. 40 of reply)
16.	Offer of possession	09.05.2019 (As per page no. 64 of the complaint)
17.	Possession letter	13.06.2019 (As per page no. 66 of the complaint)

18.	Delay in delivery of possession from date of endorsement (28.06.2017) till offer of possession (09.05.2019) + 2 months i.e.; 09.07.2019	2 years 11 days

B. Facts of the complaint

3. That the original allottee booked a residential flat in the project of the respondent namely "Indiabulls Enigma" at Sector 110, Gurgaon in Pawala Khusrupur Village, Gurgaon Tehsil, Gurgaon (hereinafter, "the project").

4. That the representatives of Indiabulls Real Estate Ltd. represented to the original allottee that the Indiabulls is developing the above project through its 100% subsidiary M/s. Athena Infrastructure Ltd. It was stated that the Indiabulls Enigma is a premium high-end multi-storey project being developed with the assistance of internationally renowned architects. It was also represented that all necessary sanctions and approvals has been obtained from the concerned competent authorities, to complete the project within the promised time frame.

5. That the original allottee was to book the above flat by showing brochures and advertisements material depicting that the project will be developed as a state-of-art project and shall be one of its kind. Mr. Hardesh Dhingra was influenced by the rosy pictures put forth by the representations of the respondent.

6. That Mr. Hardesh Dhingra was induced by the assurances and promises made by the respondent/ promoter and accordingly, booked a flat with the

respondent. Pursuant to the booking, an allotment vide allotment letter dated 23.11.2011 was made in favour of Mr. Hardesh Dhingra.

7. That a flat buyer agreement (hereinafter, "FBA") dated 04.01.2012 was executed between the parties and vide aforesaid FBA the respondent allotted flat bearing No. J-061 on 6th floor in tower No. J, admeasuring super area of 3880 sq. ft. to Mr. Hardesh Dhingra. It is pertinent to mention that the complainants herein are the subsequent allottees of flat bearing No. J-061 as earlier it was in the name of Mr. Hardesh Dhingra. The complainants after making substantial payment to the earlier allottee stepped in the shoes of original allottees. The respondent endorsed the flat buyer agreement dated 04.01.2012 in favour of the complainants vide endorsement sheet dated 26.06.2017 and add-on endorsement dated 08.11.2017.

8. That the complainants have paid a total sum of Rs. 2,42,91,427/- towards the aforesaid residential flat from January 2012 to as and when demanded by the respondent. During the execution of the flat buyer agreement the respondent/ promoter had endorsed the payment receipts in favour of the complainants which were previously in the name of earlier allottee. The respondent has collected more than 100% of the sale consideration, which is also in terms with the construction linked payment plan, however despite collecting 100% payment, the respondent/ promoter was miserably failed to offer the possession of the flat in question till 09.05.2019.

9. That the respondent promised to complete the project within a period of 36 months from the date of execution of the flat buyer agreement with a further

grace period of six months. The flat buyer's agreement was executed on 04.01.2012. That the respondent has failed to complete the project in time, resulting in extreme kind of mental distress, pain and agony to the complainants.

10. That on 09.05.2019, after an inordinate delay of around 5 years, the respondent offered the possession to the complainants and on 13.06.2019 the complainants took over the possession of the said flat.

11. That the project of the respondent comprises of towers A to J. The towers, i.e. A to C and E to J are being developed by subsidiary of Indiabulls namely Athena Infrastructure Ltd. It was presented to the complainants that towers A to D will have 17 floors. However, during the construction the respondent and another subsidiary of Indiabulls namely M/s. Varali Properties Ltd. changed the original plan and revised the same to the detriment of the complainants and unilaterally increased 4 floors in towers A to D. The increase in floors/increase in FAR changed the entire theme of the project. It shall ultimately disturb the density of the colony and its basic design & it will create an extra burden on the common amenities and facilities.

12. That the respondent increased the saleable area much more than was originally represented by them, which will lead to a strain on the common facilities like open areas, car parking space, club facilities, swimming pool usage, as with an increase in population density, the ease of the use of common facilities is seriously compromised against the interest of the complainants. Moreover, the strength of the structure of tower A to D has

been compromised of the foundation designed and built for 17 floors would not withstand the additional load of 4 floors.

13. That the respondent did not seek the consent of the complainants for increasing the floors and increased the floors in a secretive manner. It is stated that the enhancement of FAR is in total violation of representations made in the respondent' advertisement material displayed at site as well as on the internet.

14. That the unlawful act of increasing the FAR, the respondent referred to an obscure notice released by the respondent in non-descript newspaper(s) advertising the said change in plan. This unconscionable act is clear violation of the legal mandate whereby the developer is required to invite objections from allottees before seeking any revision in the original building plans. In this regard, it is pertinent to note that the respondent has the complete contact details including phone numbers and email ID of the complainants regular communication has been initiated, yet the respondent never communicated any intention or actions to revise the sanctioned building plans. It is worthwhile to mention that the respondent has been sending various communications and demands, vide emails, but the respondent conveniently avoided taking approval of the complainants for the major changes in sanction plans, which has changed the fundamental nature of the project.

15. That the complainants have made various visits at the site and observed that there are serious quality issues with respect to the construction carried out

by respondent till now. The flats were sold by representing that the same will be luxurious apartment however, all such representations seem to have been made in order to lure complainants to purchase the flats at extremely high prices. The respondent has compromised with levels of quality and are guilty of mis-selling. There are various deviations from the initial representations. The respondent marketed luxury high end apartments, but, they have compromised even with the basic features, designs and quality to save costs. The structure, which has been constructed, on face of it is of extremely poor quality. The construction is totally unplanned, with sub-standard low grade defective and despicable construction quality.

16. That the respondent sold the project stating that it will be next landmark in luxury housing and will redefine the meaning of luxury but the respondent has converted the project into a concrete jungle. There are no visible signs of alleged luxuries.

17. That the respondent has breached the fundamental term of the contract by inordinately delaying in delivery of the possession. The agreement was executed on 04.01.2012, the project was to be completed in 3 years with grace period of six months. The respondent has committed various acts of omission and commission by making incorrect and false statement in the advertisement material as well as by committing other serious acts as mentioned in preceding paragraph. The project has been inordinately delayed for around 5 years. The complainants are entitled for interest @

18% p.a. for every month of delay till the possession of the apartment is offered to the complainants i.e., 09.05.2019.

C. Relief sought by the complainants:

18. The complainants have sought following relief:

    i. Direct the respondent to award delay interest @ 18% p.a. for every month of delay to the complainants from the due date i.e., 04.07.2015 till the offer of possession of the apartment i.e., 09.05.2019.

    ii. Direct the respondent to pay a sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- to the complainants towards the cost of the litigation.

19. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondent/promoter about the contravention as alleged to have been committed in relation to section 11(4)(a) of the Act to plead guilty or not to plead guilty.

D. Reply by the respondent:

20. That the present complaint is devoid of any merits and has been preferred with the sole motive to harass the respondent and is liable to be dismissed on the ground that the said claim of the complainants is unjustified, misconceived and without any basis as against the respondent.

21. That the present complaint is otherwise also not maintainable, either in law or facts. It is hereby submitted that the complainants in the present complaint are not the original allottee of the subject unit, complainant No.1 purchased the flat in question from its original allottee i.e. Mr. Hardesh Kumar Dhingra, on 28.06.2017, and later on complainant No.2 was

impleaded as allottee no.2 on 08.11.2017. It is pertinent to mention herein that the complainants who were well aware about the status of the construction carried out at the project, voluntarily got the allotment of the subject unit transferred onto their name from its original Allottee. It is submitted the complainants with eyes wide open, took over the agreement from the original allottees, and accordingly allotment of the subject unit was endorsed in favour of the complainants on 08.11.2017.

22. That the present complainant of the complainants seeking delay merely on ground that they have stepped into the shoes of the previous allottees, and that the provisions of the FBA would apply to them as if he was the original allottee, flies in the face of all logic and reason, is entirely untenable and simply cannot be accepted.

23. That the instant compliant filed by the complainants is outside the purview of this authority as the complainants who looking into the financial viability of the project and its future monetary benefits willingly got the subject unit transferred from its original allottee with a sole purpose of investment and monetary gains out of the said investment. It is submitted that prior to the said transfer the complainant No.1 i.e., Abeda Khan already booked a flat bearing no. A083 in the same project of the respondent in the year 2012, the possession whereof has already been taken by her by way of execution of conveyance deed in her favour. It is submitted that the subject unit was purchased by the complainants from its original allottee for earning maximum commercial gains from the same.

24. That the relationship between the complainants and the respondent came into existence by way of document executed between them i.e. the endorsement Sheet dated 28.06.2017That as per the terms of the agreement, it was specifically agreed that in the eventuality of any dispute, if any, with respect to the subject transferred unit, the same shall be adjudicated through the arbitration mechanism as detailed therein. Clause no. 49 is being reproduced hereunder:

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

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

25. That the complainants have not come before this authority with clean hands and wishes to take advantage of his own misdoings with the help of the provisions of the RERA, which have been propagated for the benefit of

innocent customers who are end-users and not defaulters, like the complainant in the present complaint.

26. That it is pertinent to mention here that from the very beginning it was in the knowledge of the complainants, that there is a mechanism detailed in the flat buyer's agreement which covers the exigencies of inordinate delay caused in completion and handing over of the booked unit i.e. enumerated in the "clause 22" of duly executed flat buyer's agreement filed by the complainants along with their complaint. The respondent carves leave of this authority to refer & rely upon the clause 22 of flat buyer's agreement which is being reproduced hereunder:

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

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

27. It is submitted that the present complaint is not maintainable, and the period of delivery as defined in clause 21 of flat buyer's agreement is not sacrosanct as in the said clause it is clearly stated that "the developer shall endeavour to complete the construction of the said building/unit" within the stipulated time. Clause 21 of the said agreement has been given a selective reading by the complainants even though he conveniently relies on same. The clause reads:

> *"The developer shall endeavour to complete the construction of the said building/unit within a period of three years, with a six months grace*

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

The reading of the said clause clearly shows that the delivery of the unit / apartment in question was subject to timely payment of the instalments towards the basic sale price. As shown in the preceding paras the complainants have failed in observing his part of liability of the said clause. The complainants became the provisional allottee of the subject unit, accordingly, the time period with respect to handing over possession of the subject unit got commenced from the said date of endorsement.

28. That in the present complaint, the stand of the complainants is that they had stepped into the shoes of the previous buyers and therefore seeking delay interest @ 18% from due date of possession as pet the original FBA i.e. 04.07.2015 till offer of possession i.e. 09.05.2019 is baseless. That the provisions of the FBA would begin to apply to the complainants from the date on which their names have been endorsed in the FBA i.e., 28.06.2017. Therefore, the period of three years for handing over possession, for the complainants, would commence from 28.06.2017 and accordingly, the possession would require to be offered within 42 months i.e., 28.06.2020, and six months beyond being grace period i.e., December 2020. In fact, possession had already been offered on 13.06.2019, as such, the question of any delay in handing over the possession does not arise in the present complaint.

29. That it is pertinent to mention herein that the complainants have deliberately concealed a material fact form the authority that, the

complainants at the time of purchasing and transferring of the subject unit executed an indemnity bond in favour of the respondent, wherein specifically confirming that they are completely satisfied with the unit and project, and further have indemnified the respondent from breach of terms and conditions of the application form and the buyer's agreement. Hence, the present claim of the complainants is liable to be dismissed.

30. That the project of the respondent i.e., Indiabulls Enigma, which is being developed in an area of around 19.856 acres of land, in which the complainants invested their money is an on-going project and is registered under Act of 2016. It is pertinent to note that the respondent being a customer-oriented company completed the construction of the tower in which the unit allotted to the complainants is located and the respondent applied for the grant of the occupation certificate on 30.04.2018 before the Director, Town & Country Planning Department, Chandigarh, and the same was granted by the concerned authorities on 17.09.2018 vide memo bearing no. ZP-617/SD(BS)/2018/26771, as such it is pertinent to mention that the respondent completed the construction of the subject unit including the tower on or before 30.04.2018 wherein the application for grant of occupation certificate was applied by the respondent before the DTCP, Chandigarh.

31. That the respondent vide its letter dated 09.05.2019 offered possession of the subject unit to the complainants and vide the said letter the complainants were called upon to remit their outstanding dues of Rs. 16,19,843/- towards

the total sale consideration of the subject unit, and to take possession of the subject unit on or before 05.08.2019. Accordingly, the complainants took the physical possession of the unit by executing conveyance deed on 13.06.2019.

32. That it is a universally known fact that due to adverse market conditions viz. delay due to reinitiating of the existing work orders under GST regime, by virtue of which all the bills of contractors were held between, delay due to the directions by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and National Green Tribunal whereby the construction activities were stopped, non-availability of the water required for the construction of the project work & non-availability of drinking water for labour due to process change from issuance of HUDA slips for the water to totally online process with the formation of GMDA, shortage of labour, raw materials etc., which continued for around 22 months, starting from February'2015.

33. That as per the license to develop the project, EDCs were paid to the state government and the state government in lieu of the EDCs was supposed to lay the whole infrastructure in the licensed area for providing the basic amenities such as drinking water, sewerage, drainage including storm water line, roads etc. That the state government terribly failed to provide the basic amenities due to which the construction progress of the project was badly hit.

34. That furthermore, the Ministry of Environment and Forest (hereinafter referred to as the "MoEF") and the Ministry of Mines (hereinafter referred to as the "MoM") had imposed certain restrictions which resulted in a drastic reduction in the availability of bricks and availability of kiln which is the most basic ingredient in the construction activity. The MoEF restricted the excavation of topsoil for the manufacture of bricks and further directed that

no manufacturing of clay bricks or tiles or blocks can be done within a radius of 50 kilometres from coal and lignite based thermal power plants without mixing at least 25% of ash with soil. The shortage of bricks in the region and the resultant non-availability of raw materials required in the construction of the project also affected the timely schedule of construction of the project.

35. That in view of the ruling by the Hon'ble Apex Court directing for suspension of all the mining operations in the Aravalli hill range in state of Haryana within the area of approx. 448 sq. kms in the district of Faridabad and Gurgaon including Mewat which led to a situation of scarcity of the sand and other materials which derived from the stone crushing activities , which directly affected the construction schedules and activities of the project.

36. Apart from the above, the following circumstances also contributed to the delay in timely completion of the project:

a) That commonwealth games were organized in Delhi in October 2010. Due to this mega event, construction of several big projects including the construction of commonwealth games village took place in 2009 and onwards in Delhi and NCR region. This led to an extreme shortage of labour in the NCR region as most of the labour force got employed in said projects required for the commonwealth games. Moreover, during the commonwealth games the labour/workers were forced to leave the NCR region for security reasons. This also led to immense shortage of labour force in the NCR region. This drastically affected the availability of labour in the NCR region which had a ripple effect and hampered the development of this complex.

b) Moreover, due to active implementation of social schemes like National Rural Employment Guarantee Act and Jawaharlal Nehru National

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

c) Further, due to slow pace of construction, a tremendous pressure was put on the contractors engaged to carry out various activities in the project due to which there was a dispute with the contractors resulting into foreclosure and termination of their contracts and we had to suffer huge losses which resulted in delayed timelines. That despite the best efforts, the ground realities hindered the progress of the project. **Inability to undertake the construction for approx. 7-8 months due to Central Government's Notification about Demonetization:** The respondent had awarded the construction of the project to one of the leading construction companies of India. The said contractor/ company could not implement the entire project for approx. 7-8 months w.e.f. from 9-10 November 2016 the day when the central government issued notification about demonetization. During this period, the contractor could not make payment in cash to the labour. During demonetization, the cash withdrawal limit for companies was capped at Rs. 24,000 per week initially whereas cash payments to labour on the site of magnitude of the project in question is Rs. 3-4 lakhs approx. per

day and the work at site got almost halted for 7-8 months as bulk of the labour being unpaid went to their hometowns, which resulted into shortage of labour. Hence the implementation of the project in question got delayed on account of the issues faced by contractor due to the said notification of central government. That the said event of demonetization was beyond the control of the respondent company, hence the time period for offer of possession should deemed to be extended for 6 months on account of the above.

d) **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 this, there was a delay of 3-4 months as labour went back to their hometowns, which resulted in shortage of labour in April -May 2015, November- December 2016 and November- December 2017. The district administration issued the requisite directions in this regard.

In view of the above, construction work remained very badly affected for 6-12 months due to the above stated major events and conditions which were beyond the control of the respondent and the said period would also require to be added for calculating the delivery date of possession if any.

e) **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.

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

37. That it is pertinent to mention that the project of the respondent i.e., Indiabulls Enigma, which is being developed in an area of around 19.856 acres of land, in which the applicant has invested its money is an on-going project and is registered under The Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 and the respondent has already offered the possession of the subject unit to the complainants, however the complainants have now after 21 months of taking possession of the subject unit have filed the present complaint to extort the respondent by taking undue benefits of the provisions of the Act of 2016 & rules.

38. That the complainants have merely alleged in their complaint about delay on part of the respondent in handing over of possession but have failed to substantiate the same. The fact is that the respondent, has been acting in consonance with the FBA executed and no contravention in terms of the

same can be projected on the respondent. In view of the same, it is submitted that there is no cause of action in favour of the complainants to institute the present complaint.

39. Copies of all the relevant documents have been filed and placed on the record. Their authenticity is not in dispute. Hence, the complaint can be decided based on these undisputed documents.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

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

E. I Territorial jurisdiction

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

E. II Subject matter jurisdiction

41. Section 11(4)(a) of the Act, 2016 provides that the promoter shall be responsible to the allottees 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.

42. So, in view of the provisions of the Act of 2016 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 complainants at a later stage.

F. Findings on the objections raised by the respondent:

F.I Objection regarding complainants are in breach of agreement for non-invocation of arbitration.

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

"Clause 49: All or any dispute arising out or touching upon or in relation to the terms of this Application and/or Flat Buyers agreement including the interpretation and validity of the terms thereof and the rights and obligations of the parties shall be settled amicably by mutual discussion failing which the same shall be settled through Arbitration The arbitration shall be governed by Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 or any statutory amendments/ modifications thereof for the time being in force. The venue of the arbitration shall be New Delhi and it shall be held by a sole arbitrator who shall be appointed by the Company and whose decision shall be final and binding upon the parties. The Applicant(s) hereby confirms that he/she shall have no objection to this appointment even if the

person so appointed as the Arbitrator, is an employee or advocate of the company or is otherwise connected to the Company and the Applicant(s) confirms that notwithstanding such relationship / connection, the Applicant(s) shall have no doubts as to the independence or impartiality of the said Arbitrator. The courts in New Delhi alone shall have the jurisdiction over the disputes arising out of the Application/Apartment Buyers Agreement ....."

44. The respondent contended that as per the terms & conditions of the application form duly executed between the parties, it was specifically agreed that in the eventuality of any dispute, if any, with respect to the provisional booked unit by the complainants, the same shall be adjudicated through arbitration mechanism. The authority is of the opinion that the jurisdiction of the authority cannot be fettered by the existence of an arbitration clause in the buyer's agreement as it may be noted that section 79 of the Act bars the jurisdiction of civil courts about any matter which falls within the purview of this authority, or the Real Estate Appellate Tribunal. Thus, the intention to render such disputes as non-arbitrable seems to be clear. Also, section 88 of the Act says that the provisions of this Act shall be in addition to and not in derogation of the provisions of any other law for the time being in force. Further, the authority puts reliance on catena of judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, particularly in ***National Seeds Corporation Limited v. M. Madhusudhan Reddy & Anr. (2012) 2 SCC 506***, wherein it has been held that the remedies provided under the Consumer Protection Act are in addition to and not in derogation of the other laws in force, consequently the authority would not be bound to refer parties to arbitration even if the agreement between the parties had an arbitration clause. Further, in ***Aftab Singh and ors. v. Emaar MGF Land Ltd and ors., Consumer case no. 701 of 2015 decided on 13.07.2017***, the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi (NCDRC) has held that the arbitration clause in agreements between the complainants 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 Complainant and the Builder cannot circumscribe the jurisdiction of a Consumer Fora, notwithstanding the amendments made to Section 8 of the Arbitration Act."*

45. 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."*

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

F.II. Objection regarding delay due to force majeure

47. The respondent-promoter raised the contention that the construction of the project was delayed due to force majeure conditions such as commonwealth games held in Delhi, shortage of labour due to implementation of various social schemes by Government of India, slow pace of construction due to a dispute with the contractor, various orders passed by NGT and weather conditions in Gurugram and non-payment of instalment by different allottees of the project but all the pleas advanced in this regard are devoid of merit. The flat buyer's agreement was executed between the respondent and

original allottee on 04.01.2012 and the events taking place such as holding of commonwealth games, dispute with the contractor, implementation of various schemes by central govt. etc. do not have any impact on the project being developed by the respondent. Though some allottees may not be regular in paying the amount due but whether the interest of all the stakeholders concerned with the said project be put on hold due to fault of on hold due to fault of some of the allottees. Thus, the promoter respondent cannot be given any leniency on based of aforesaid reasons and it is well settled principle that a person cannot take benefit of his own wrong.

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

Another contention of the respondent is that authority is deprived of the jurisdiction to go into the interpretation of, or rights of the parties inter-se in accordance with the flat buyer's agreement executed between the parties and no agreement for sale as referred to under the provisions of the Act or the said rules has been executed inter se parties. The authority is of the view that the Act nowhere provides, nor can be so construed, that all previous agreements will be re-written after coming into force of the Act. Therefore, the provisions of the Act, rules and agreement have to be read and interpreted harmoniously. However, if the Act has provided for dealing with certain specific provisions/situation in a specific/particular manner, then that situation will be dealt with in accordance with the Act and the rules after the date of coming into force of the Act and the rules. Numerous provisions of the Act save the provisions of the agreements made between the buyers and sellers. The said contention has been upheld in the landmark judgment of ***Neelkamal Realtors Suburban Pvt. Ltd. Vs. UOI and others. (W.P 2737 of 2017)*** which provides as under:

119. Under the provisions of Section 18, the delay in handing over the possession would be counted from the date mentioned in the agreement for sale entered into by the promoter and the allottee prior to its registration under RERA. Under the provisions of RERA, the promoter is given a facility to revise the date of completion of project and declare the same under Section 4. The RERA does not contemplate rewriting of contract between the flat purchaser and the promoter.....

122. We have already discussed that above stated provisions of the RERA are not retrospective in nature. They may to some extent be having a retroactive or quasi retroactive effect but then on that ground the validity of the provisions of RERA cannot be challenged. The Parliament is competent enough to legislate law having retrospective or retroactive effect. A law can be even framed to affect subsisting / existing contractual rights between the parties in the larger public interest. We do not have any doubt in our mind that the RERA has been framed in the larger public interest after a thorough study and discussion made at the highest level by the Standing Committee and Select Committee, which submitted its detailed reports."

48. 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."

49. The agreements are sacrosanct save and except for the provisions which have been abrogated by the Act itself. Further, it is noted that the builder-buyer agreements have been executed in the manner that there is no scope left to the allottee to negotiate any of the clauses contained therein. Therefore, the authority is of the view that the charges payable under various heads shall be payable as per the agreed terms and conditions of the agreement subject to the condition that the same are in accordance with the

plans/permissions approved by the respective departments/competent authorities and are not in contravention of any other Act, rules, statutes, instructions, directions issued thereunder and are not unreasonable or exorbitant in nature.

F.IV Objection regarding entitlement of DPC on ground of complainants being investor

50. The respondent has taken a stand that the complainants are the investors and not consumers, therefore, they are not entitled to the protection of the Act and thereby not entitled to file the complaint under section 31 of the Act. The respondent also submitted that the preamble of the Act states that the Act is enacted to protect the interest of consumers of the real estate sector. The authority observed that the respondent is correct in stating that the Act is enacted to protect the interest of consumers of the real estate sector. It is settled principle of interpretation that preamble is an introduction of a statute and states main aims & objects of enacting a statute but at the same time preamble cannot be used to defeat the enacting provisions of the Act. Furthermore, it is pertinent to note that any aggrieved person can file a complaint against the promoter if the promoter contravenes or violates any provisions of the Act or rules or regulations made thereunder. Upon careful perusal of all the terms and conditions of the apartment buyer's agreement, it is revealed that the complainants are buyer and they have paid total price of Rs.2,42,91,427/- to the promoter towards purchase of an apartment in the project of the promoter. At this stage, it is important to stress upon the

definition of term allottee under the Act, the same is reproduced below for ready reference:

> *"2(d) "allottee" in relation to a real estate project means the person to whom a plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, has been allotted, sold (whether as freehold or leasehold) or otherwise transferred by the promoter, and includes the person who subsequently acquires the said allotment through sale, transfer or otherwise but does not include a person to whom such plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, is given on rent;"*

51. In view of above-mentioned definition of "allottee" as well as all the terms and conditions of the apartment buyer's agreement executed between promoter and complainants, it is crystal clear that the complainants are allottee(s) as the subject unit was allotted to them by the promoter. The concept of investor is not defined or referred in the Act. As per the definition given under section 2 of the Act, there will be "promoter" and "allottee" and there cannot be a party having a status of "investor". The Maharashtra Real Estate Appellate Tribunal in its order dated 29.01.2019 in appeal no. 0006000000010557 titled as ***M/s Srushti Sangam Developers Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Sarvapriya Leasing (P) Ltd. And anr.*** has also held that the concept of investor is not defined or referred in the Act. Thus, the contention of promoter that the allottee being an investor is not entitled to protection of this Act also stands rejected.

G. Findings regarding relief sought by the complainants.

52. **Relief sought by the complainants:**

i) Direct the respondent to award delay interest @ 18% p.a. for every month of delay from the due date i.e., 04.07.2015 till the offer of possession of the apartment i.e., 09.05.2019 to the complainants.

ii) Direct the respondent to pay a sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- to the complainants towards the cost of the litigation.

G.I Direct the respondent to award delay interest @ 18% p.a. for every month of delay to the complainants from the due date i.e., 04.07.2015 till the offer of possession of the apartment i.e., 09.05.2019.

53. In the present complaint, the complainants intends to continue with the project and is seeking delay possession charges as provided under the proviso to section 18(1) of the Act. Sec. 18(1) proviso reads as under:

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

54. As per clause 21 of the flat buyer's agreement dated 04.01.2012, the possession of the subject unit was to be handed over by of 04.07.2015. Clause 21 of the flat buyer's agreement provides for handover of possession and is reproduced below:

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

55. The flat buyer's agreement is a pivotal legal document which should ensure that the rights and liabilities of both builders/promoters and buyers/allottees are protected candidly. The 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 flat buyer's agreement which would thereby protect the rights of both the builder and buyer in the unfortunate event of a dispute that may arise. It should be drafted in the simple and unambiguous language which may be understood by a common man with an ordinary educational background. It should contain a provision about stipulated time of delivery of possession of the apartment, plot or building, as the case may be and the right of the buyers/allottees 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.

56. 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 complainants not being in default under any provisions of this agreements and in compliance with all provisions, formalities and documentation as prescribed by the promoter. The drafting of this clause and incorporation of such conditions are not only vague and uncertain but so heavily loaded in favour of the promoter and against the allottee that even a single default by the allottee in fulfilling

formalities and documentations etc. as prescribed by the promoter may make the possession clause irrelevant for the purpose of allottee and the commitment date for handing over possession loses its meaning. The incorporation of such clause in the flat buyer's agreement by the promoter is just to evade the liability towards timely delivery of subject unit and to deprive the allottee of his right accruing after delay in possession. This is just to comment as to how the builder has misused his dominant position and drafted such mischievous clause in the agreement and the allottee is left with no option but to sign on the dotted lines.

57. In the present case, the complainants/subsequent allottees has purchased the unit on 28.06.2017 i.e. after expiry of the due date of handing over possession (04.07.2015), the authority is of the view that the subsequent allottee cannot be expected to wait for any uncertain length of time to take possession. Even such allottees are waiting for their promised flats and surely, they would be entitled to all the reliefs under this Act. It would no doubt be fair to assume that the subsequent allottee had knowledge of delay, however, to attribute knowledge that such delay would continue indefinitely, based on priori assumption, would not be justified. The authority holds that in cases where subsequent allottee had stepped into the shoes of original allottee after the expiry of due date of handing over possession, the subsequent allottee shall be entitled to delayed possession charges w.e.f. the date of entering into the shoes of original allottee i.e. nomination letter or date of endorsement on the builder buyer's agreement, whichever is earlier.

58. It is to be noted that in the present case, there are two endorsement sheets dated 28.06.2017 and 08.11.2017. The subject unit of the complaint and the concerned agreement dated 04.07.2015 was transferred in favour of Ms.

Abeda Khan i.e. complainant no. 1, vide endorsement sheet dated 28.06.2017 annexed on page no. 60 of the complaint. Whereas endorsement sheet dated 08.11.2017 annexed on page no. 61 of the complaint, is a "endorsement add on" which is executed to add the name of Mr. Sajid Khan i.e. complainant no. 2 wherein all the rights and liabilities have been jointly entitled in the name of present complainants. The authority is of view that since the endorsement (add-on) sheet dated 08.11.2017 is executed only to add the name of complainant no. 2, whereas the subject unit was already transferred in the name of complainant no. 1 on 28.06.2017. The rights and liabilities associated with the concerned unit, whether contractual or statutory, has been transferred in the name of complainant no. 1 on 28.06.2017 only. Therefore, the authority is of considered view that the due date for calculation of delayed possession charges shall be 28.06.2017.

59. **Admissibility of grace period:** The respondent promoter has proposed to complete the construction of the said building/ unit within a period of 3 years, with six months grace period thereon from the date of execution of the flat buyer's agreement. In the present case, the promoter is seeking 6 months' time as grace period. The said period of 6 months is allowed to the promoter for the exigencies beyond the control of the promoter. As such, the due date of possession comes out to be 04.07.2015. Since the complainants are subsequent allottees and the subject unit is endorsed to the complainants on 28.06.2017, i.e. after due date of handing over of possession which is 04.07.2015. Therefore, the due date for calculation of delayed possession charges shall be 28.06.2017.

60. **Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** The complainants are seeking delay possession charges however, proviso to section 18 provides that where an allottee does not intend to withdraw from

the project, he shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay, till the handing over of possession, at such rate as may be prescribed and it has been prescribed under rule 15 of the rules. Rule 15 has been reproduced as under:

> ***Rule 15. Prescribed rate of interest- [Proviso to section 12, section 18 and sub-section (4) and subsection (7) of section 19]***
>
> *(1) For the purpose of proviso to section 12; section 18; and sub-sections (4) and (7) of section 19, the "interest at the rate prescribed" shall be the State Bank of India highest marginal cost of lending rate +2%.:*
> *Provided that in case the State Bank of India marginal cost of lending rate (MCLR) is not in use, it shall be replaced by such benchmark lending rates which the State Bank of India may fix from time to time for lending to the general public.*

61. The legislature in its wisdom in the subordinate legislation under the provision of rule 15 of the rules, has determined the prescribed rate of interest. The rate of interest so determined by the legislature, is reasonable and if the said rule is followed to award the interest, it will ensure uniform practice in all the cases.

62. Consequently, as per website of the State Bank of India i.e., https://sbi.co.in, the marginal cost of lending rate (in short, MCLR) as on date i.e., 10.02.2022 is @ 7.30%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 9.30%.

63. The definition of term 'interest' as defined under section 2(za) of the Act provides that the rate of interest chargeable from the allottee by the promoter, in case of default, shall be equal to the rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottee, in case of default. The relevant section is reproduced below:

> *"(za) "interest" means the rates of interest payable by the promoter or the allottee, as the case may be.*
> *Explanation. —For the purpose of this clause—*

(i) *the rate of interest chargeable from the allottee by the promoter, in case of default, shall be equal to the rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottee, in case of default.*

(ii) *the interest payable by the promoter to the allottee shall be from the date the promoter received the amount or any part thereof till the date the amount or part thereof and interest thereon is refunded, and the interest payable by the allottee to the promoter shall be from the date the allottee defaults in payment to the promoter till the date it is paid;"*

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

G.II Direct the respondent to award litigation cost of Rs. 1,00,000/- towards litigation expenses.

64. The complainants are claiming compensation in the above-mentioned reliefs. The authority is of the view that it is important to understand that the Act has clearly provided interest and compensation as separate entitlement/rights which the allottee can claim. For claiming compensation under sections 12, 14, 18 and section 19 of the Act, the complainants may file a separate complaint before Adjudicating Officer under section 31 read with section 71 of the Act and rule 29 of the rules.

65. Section 19(10) of the Act obligates the allottees 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 is obtained on 17.09.2018 and subsequently, the possession of the allotted unit was offered on 09.05.2019. Therefore, in the interest of natural justice, the complainants should be given 2 months' time from the date of offer of possession. This 2 months' of reasonable time is being given to the complainants 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 endorsement i.e. 28.06.2017 till the expiry of 2 months from the date of offer of possession.

66. Accordingly, it is the failure of the promoter to fulfil its obligations and responsibilities as per the agreement dated 04.01.2015 to hand over the possession within the stipulated period. Accordingly, the non-compliance of the mandate contained in section 11(4)(a) read with proviso to section 18(1) of the Act on the part of the respondent is established. As such the allottees shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay from date of endorsement i.e. 28.06.2017 till the date of offer of possession plus 2 months, at prescribed rate i.e., 9.30 % p.a. as per proviso to section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules.

H. Directions of the authority:

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

i. The respondent shall pay interest at the prescribed rate i.e. 9.30% per annum for every month of delay on the amount paid by the

complainants from date of endorsement i.e. 28.06.2017 till offer of possession (09.05.2019) plus two months i.e. 09.07.2019, as per section 18(1) of the Act of 2016 read with rule 15 of the rules.

ii. The respondent is directed to pay arrears of interest accrued within 90 days from the date of order and thereafter monthly payment of interest to be paid till date of handing over of possession shall be paid on or before the 10th of each succeeding month.

iii. 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.

iv. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainants which is not the part of buyer's agreement.

68. Complaint stands disposed of.

69. File be consigned to registry.

(Vijay Kumar Goyal)
Member

(Dr. KK Khandelwal)
Chairman
Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated:10.02.2022