

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

Complaint no.:	2114 of 2019
First date of hearing:	05.11.2019
Date of decision:	08.04.2022

Pranav Syal
R/o 85 H, Bhai Rannhir Singh Nagar, Ludhiana, Punjab **Complainant**

Versus

M/s Anjali Promoters & Developers Pvt. Ltd.
Office address: 7 Barakhamba Road, New Delhi-110001 **Respondent**

CORAM:

Dr. K. K. Khandelwal
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal

Chairman
Member

APPEARANCE:

Sh. Sanjeev Sharma (Advocate)
Sh. Venkat Rao (Advocate)

Complainant
Respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated 20.05.2019 has been filed by the complainant/allottee under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (in short, the Act) read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (in short, the Rules) for violation of section 11(4)(a) of the Act wherein it is *inter alia* prescribed that the promoter shall be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions as provided under the provision of the Act or the rules and regulations made there under or to the allottee as per the agreement for sale executed *inter se*.



A. Unit and project related details

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

S no.	Heads	Information
1.	Project name and location	"CENTRA ONE", Sector-61, Gurugram
2.	Project area	3.675 acres
3.	Nature of the project	Commercial Complex
4.	DTCP license no. and validity status	277 of 2007 dated 17.12.2007 valid up to 16.12.2019
5.	Name of licensee	Saiexpo Overseas Pvt. Ltd.
6.	RERA registration details	Not Registered
7.	Unit no.	F-07, First floor [pg. 23 of complaint]
8.	Unit measuring	1091 sq. ft. [pg. 23 of complaint]
9.	Date of allotment cum demand letter	08.09.2010 [pg. 23 of complaint]
10.	Date of execution of flat buyer agreement	Not executed
11.	Possession clause	Clause 24 <i>That company shall endeavor to make offer of possession of the said building/shop/office space/unit by 31 December 2011, subject to force majeure circumstances and compliance of all terms and conditions and timely payment of all installments by the allottees of the building. If the company fails to make offer of possession for fit outs latest by 30th June 2012, the company shall pay a compensation as mentioned in space buyers'</i>



		<p><i>agreement up till the date of making offer possession of the said premises. If the company has applied to DTCP/any other competent authority for issuance of occupation and/or completion certificate by 30 April 2012 and the delay, if any, in making offer of possession by 30th June 2012 is attributable to any delay on part of DTCP/ competent authority, then the possession may be delayed, and company shall not be liable to pay any compensation or penalty for the delay. The company, on obtaining certificate for occupation and use from the competent authorities, subject to clearance of all your dues and your compliance with all the terms and conditions of the application/allotment and standard space buyer's agreement to be executed, shall hand over the shop/office space/unit.</i></p> <p><i>(Emphasis supplied)</i></p> <p>[pg. 26 of complaint]</p>
12.	Due date of possession	30.06.2012 [Note: Grace period included]
13.	Assured return adjusted by the builder as per the statement of account attached with offer of possession dated 12.12.2018	₹ 35,92,748/-
14.	Total sale consideration as per statement of account annexed with offer of possession dated 12.12.2018	₹ 85,29,586/- [pg. 31 of complaint]



15.	Amount paid by the complainant as per statement of account annexed with offer of possession dated 12.12.2018	₹ 59,84,813/- [pg. 31 of complaint]
16.	Delay in handing over possession till the date of offer of possession plus two months i.e., 12.02.2019	6 year 7 months 13 days
17.	Occupation certificate	09.10.2018 [pg. 37 of reply]
18.	Offer of possession	12.12.2018 [pg. 29 of complaint]

B. Facts of the complaint

3. The complainant has pleaded the complaint on the following facts:

- a. That complainant purchased a shop/office unit no. F-7 amounting to Rs. 60,00,500/- along with other charges like EDC, IDC etc. total amounting to Rs. 85,29,587/-. It was assured by the promoter that timely possession shall be handed over to the buyer up to December 2011. The respondent further assured that possession date shall be part of the buyers' agreement which shall be executed between them in future course of payments. On Assurances as stated above the complainant booked unit no. F-7 paying an initial amount of Rs. 53,52,200/-.
- b. Subsequently, the allotment cum demand letter was issued to the complainant on 08.09.2010 which raised demand of Rs. 60,00,500/- while complainant had already paid called amount of Rs. 53,52,200/- to the promoters till 08.09.2010. It is to mention here that as per allotment letter the possession of the unit/office in question was to be handed over up to 31.12.20211 with a grace

- period of 6 months as provided under clause 24 of the allotment letter/agreement, the possession was to be handed lastly by 30.06.2012.
- c. That the space buyer's agreement was signed between both the parties i.e., M/s. Anjali Promoters & Developers Pvt. Ltd. and the complainant on terms and conditions as laid down by the company. The space buyer's agreement is misplaced during further period. All Instalments are paid as demanded by the respondent time and again. A total amount of Rs. 59,84,813/- paid up to the time of offer of possession letter dated 12.12.2018.
- d. That as per the space buyer's agreement/allotment letter the possession of the unit in question was to be handed lastly by June 2012, however at that time the construction of the project was far from completion.
- e. That the complainant after an exorbitant delay of 6½ years received letter for offer of possession on 12.12.2018 with respect to the unit in question, however though the respondent offered the possession of the unit in question after a delay of 6½ years, however no interest for the delayed period was offered by the respondent to the complainant and aggrieved of which the complainant visited the office of the respondent with the request to pay interest for the delayed possession but the same were in vain. That further while giving offer of possession the respondent without consent of the complainant increases the area of the unit from 1091 sq. ft. to 1255 sq. ft.
- f. That as per statement of account cum invoice as on 11.01.2019 net payable after adjustment of assured return, the net balance amount collected in excess is of Rs. 10,47,974/- from complainant.

Therefore, excess amount of Rs. 10,47,974/- had be paid to complainant along with interest.

C. Relief sought by the complainant:

4. The complainant has sought following reliefs:

- a. Respondent shall be directed to provide a copy of the occupation certificate or application for obtaining occupation certificate along with mandatory documents annexed with such application.
- b. Respondent shall be directed to provide a copy of declaration made by the promoter under all sub clause of clause (1) of sub section (2) of section 4.
- c. Respondent shall be directed to provide a copy of registered declaration w.r.t common area, parking area, carpet area, super area etc. made by the respondent to the competent authorities as required under the law.
- d. The respondent shall be directed to pay the interest for the delayed period of handing over the possession from the time as stated under clause (za) of section 2.
- e. The respondent shall also be directed to pay interest for the period of complaint, pending before the Real Estate Regulatory Authority as it was an obligation cast upon him under the act to provide and pay the interest automatically under the act. The respondent failed to pay the interest when demanded.
- f. The respondent shall be ordered to recalculate the interest to be charged or already charged at the same rate of interest at which he is ordered to pay to the allottee i.e., @State Bank of India highest marginal cost of lending rate plus (2%) two percent.



- g. The respondent shall be ordered not to charge any holding charges, interest on the pending payments at the time of offer of handing over the possession after the settlement of dues as per RERA Act.
 - h. The extra money charged on account of parking charges, club housing charges and such other incidental charges be refunded back to the complainant along with interest.
 - i. The respondent shall be directed to comply with the drawings and approved plans sanctioned by the competent authority and inform the complainant about the non-compliance of promises made to the complainant if any.
 - j. The respondent shall be restrained from making threatening demands of the pending dues once the complaint regarding interest etc. is pending before the authorities under the act.
 - k. Respondent shall be directed to get the conveyance deed of common areas and super areas be made in the name of association of allottees.
 - l. That this Hon'ble Authority may direct the respondent to pay litigation cost @ Rs. 50,000/- to the complainant.
5. 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

6. The respondent has contested the complaint on the following grounds:
- a. That upon completion of construction and upon getting/securing occupancy certificate from competent authority, respondent has issued the offer of possession letter on 12.12.2018. The respondent



- herein is also entitled for holding charges for the two years as the complainant has grossly defaulted in making the payment on time.
- b. That the complainant is a defaulter/offender under section 19(6), 19(7) and 19(10) of the Act, 2016 and not in compliance of these sections. The complainant cannot seek any relief under the provision of The Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 or rules frame thereunder. In this regard it is submitted that the complainant is also duty bound to take the possession of the unit within two months of the receipt of the notice for offer of possession. In the present case, the offer of possession was issued way back in 2018 but the complainant has abstained from taking the possession for two years. It is submitted that the complainant has failed to take over the possession of the allotted unit even after lapse of more than two year from the date of offer of possession. It is submitted that the transaction is being governed by the terms mentioned in application form duly signed by the complainant. In addition to this, complainant is also liable to pay the maintenance charges as per the maintenance agreement under clause 15 of the application form irrespective of the fact whether complainant is having actual possession of the unit or not.
- c. That the complainant has approached this hon'ble authority for redressal of his alleged grievances with unclean hands, i.e. by not disclosing material facts pertaining to the case at hand and also, by distorting and/or misrepresenting the actual factual situation with regard to several aspects. It is further submitted that the hon'ble apex court in plethora of decisions has laid down strictly, that a party approaching the court for any relief, must come with clean hands, without concealment and/or misrepresentation of material facts, as

the same amounts to fraud not only against the respondent but also against the court and in such situation, the complaint is liable to be dismissed at the threshold without any further adjudication.

- i. That the complainant has concealed from this hon'ble authority that the complainant along with his wife Loveleen Sayal has initially applied in the project "Resort" wherein the complainant only paid a booking amount of Rs. 5,00,000/-, however later the complainant transferred the said booking amount in a new booking in the project "centra one" of the respondent.
- ii. That the complainant has concealed from this hon'ble authority that after due diligence and research, the complainant along with his wife have invested in unit in question. It is pertinent to mention that the complainant has approached the respondent through a broker namely "Kapur Estates" and after conducting thorough due diligence had applied in the project of the respondent.
- iii. That the complainant has concealed from this hon'ble authority that the complainant has already been offered possession by the respondent vide offer of possession letter dated 12.12.2018, however the complainant has failed to pay the outstanding amount and with a view to wriggle out from his obligation to pay has filed the present complaint. It is pertinent to mention that the respondent has duly adjusted assured return amounting to Rs. 25,44,773.89/- in complainant's account with regard to the unit in question.
- iv. That the complainant has also concealed from this hon'ble authority that the respondent being a customer centric company has always addressed the concerns of the complainant and had

requested the complainant time and again to visit the office of the respondent in order to amicably resolve the concerns of the complainant. However, notwithstanding the several efforts made by the respondent to attend to the queries of the complainant to his complete satisfaction, the complainant deliberately proceeded to file the present complaint before this hon'ble authority against the respondent.

- d. That from the above, it is very well established, that the complainant has approached this hon'ble authority with unclean hands by distorting/concealing/misrepresenting the relevant facts pertaining to the case at hand. It is further submitted that in light of the law laid down by the hon'ble apex court, the present complaint warrants dismissal without any further adjudication.
- e. That there is no delay in issuing offer of possession as in terms of clause 14 of the application form, the respondent was entitled to handover possession of the unit within 36 months from the date of sanctioning of the building plan. It is submitted that despite fulfilling all the requisites with DTCP, Haryana the building plan was not sanctioned by the DTCP without giving any cogent reason for the same. The building plan was approved only on 12.01.2018. It is evident that the unit was to be handed over within 36 months from the start of the construction which as per sanctioned building plan started only on 12.01.2018. That the offer of possession was issued on 22.11.2018 which is within 36 months from the start of the construction and thus, there is no delay.
- f. That the complainant has alleged that the respondent has delayed the project and in terms of the booking application, however it is clarified that the possession timelines as per clause 14 of the

booking application were subject to force majeure and strict adherence to the terms and conditions of the agreement. It is further submitted that the respondent with a view to create a world class commercial space, engaged renowned architects cervera and pioz of spain for the said project. The respondent also engaged renowned contractor M/s Ahluwalia Contracts (P) Ltd. for the said project. The aim of this scheme was that the project to get adequate cash flow for construction.

g. That the respondent has received occupation certificate on 09.10.2018, in accordance to which the respondent vide its letter dated 12.12.2018 has already issued offer of possession letter to the complainant thereby requesting him to clear the outstanding dues and complete the documentation in order to initiate the process of physical handover of possession of the unit in question.

7. Copies of all the documents have been filed and placed on record. The authenticity is not in dispute. Hence, the complaint can be decided on the basis of these undisputed documents.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

8. 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

9. 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

10. 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 complainants at a later stage.

F. Findings on the objections raised by the respondent

F.I. Objection raised by the respondent regarding force majeure condition

11. The respondent has submitted the following contentions to be taken into note by the authority for granting grace period on account of force majeure:
 - a. That the complainant is the allottee of a shop bearing no. F-07 in the commercial project of the respondent company, Centra One, situated in Gurugram, Haryana. The complainant in the present complaint is inter alia seeking interest on account of delay in handing over possession. The project, Centra One, is a business complex situated in Gurugram's sector 61, spread over an area of 3.675 acres. The said commercial complex has been developed by M/s Anjali Promoters Pvt. Ltd. in collaboration with M/s Saiexpo Overseas Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Countrywide Promoters Pvt. Ltd (collectively referred to as 'Company'). Subsequently, Department of Town and Country Planning, Haryana ("DTCP") has issued a license bearing no. 277 of 2007 to M/s Countrywide Promoters Pvt. Ltd. for developing a commercial complex on the said land.

- b. That the timeline for possession as per the space buyer's agreement, was proposed to be by 31st December 2011 with a further grace period of 6 months. Thus, possession of the unit in question was proposed to be handed over by 30th June 2012. It is further submitted that the said timeline for possession was subject to force majeure and timely payment of installments by the complainant.
- c. That it is pertinent to point out that both the parties as per the application form duly agreed that the respondent shall not be held responsible or liable for any failure or delay in performing any of its obligations or undertakings as provided for in the agreement, if such performance is prevented, delayed or hindered by delay on part of or intervention of statutory authorities like DTCP or the local authorities or any other cause not within the reasonable control of the Respondent. In such cases, the period in question shall automatically stand extended for the period of disruption caused by such operation, occurrence or continuation of force majeure circumstance(s).
- d. The possession timelines for the said project were subject to force majeure circumstances and timely payment of called installments by the allottees. "Force Majeure", a French term equivalent to "Vis majeure", in Latin, means "superior force". A force majeure clause is defined under the Black's Law Dictionary as 'A contractual provision allocating the risk if performance becomes impossible or impracticable, especially as a result of an event or effect that the parties could not have anticipated or controlled.
- e. That delay, if any, in handing over of possession of the units of the said project is due to reasons beyond the control of the company.



In this regard it is pertinent to point out that on 29.05.2008, the company applied for grant of approval of building plans from the DTCP.

- f. That on 21.07.2008, in the meeting of the building plan approval committee, the committee members concurred with the report of Superintending Engineer (HQ), HUDA and STP, Gurgaon who had reported that the building plans were in order. The said members also took note of the report of the STP (E&V)'s observation on the building plans. The members stated that the said observations were "minor in nature" and hence approved the building plans subject to corrections.
- g. That DTCP vide letter dated 30.07.2008 approved the building plans of the company subject to certain rectification of deficiencies. There were in total 3 deficiencies which were asked to be corrected by the company, namely, NOC from AAI to be submitted, covered area not correct and lastly fire safety measures were not provided.
- h. That in compliance with the directions issued by DTCP vide office memo no. ZP-345/6351 dated 30.07.2008, the company submitted revised building plans on 27.08.2008 vide letter dated 25.08.2008. It is pertinent to point out that since there were no further objections conveyed to the company for the release of the building plans it was assumed that the building plans would be released automatically. Since no communication was received by the company for almost 5 months, the company on its own volition enquired the reasons for delay in release of the building plans by DTCP. To its astonishment, it came to the company's knowledge that the same was being withheld by DTCP on account of EDC dues. However, no formal communication qua the same was received by

the company. Nonetheless, the company on 15.01.2009 and 16.01.2009 requested DTCP to release its building plans while submitting an undertaking to clear the EDC dues within a specified time period. It is pertinent to point out that there were no provisions in the Haryana Development and Regulation of Urban Areas Act, 1975 or the Haryana Development and Regulation of Urban Areas Rules, 1976 or any law prevalent at that time which permitted DTCP to withhold release of a building plan on account of dues towards EDC.

- i. That DTCP on 27.02.2009 after a lapse of almost six months from the date of submission of the revised building plans, conveyed the company to clear EDC/IDC dues while clearly overlooking the undertakings given by the company.
- j. That it is stated that the company, on 03.08.2010 deposited full EDC/IDC with the department. It is pertinent to mention herein that in terms of the license granted and the conditional approval of the building plans, the company had started developing the project. That to its surprise, the company received a notice by DTCP dated 19.03.2013 directing the company to deposit composition charges of Rs.7,37,15,792/- on account of alleged unauthorized construction of over an area of 34238.64 sq. mtr. The said demand was questioned by the company officials in various meetings with DTCP officials. Various representations were made by the company on 04.09.2013, 22.10.2013, 11.11.2013, 02.12.2013, 14.03.2014, 15.04.2014, 07.07.2014, 13.11.2014, 09.02.2015, 07.04.2015. The company in its representation dated 05.06.2015 pointed out all the illegalities in the demand of composition charges of Rs.7.37 crores.

- k. That instead of clarifying the issue, DTCP further issued a demand letter on 31.12.2015 directing the company to deposit Rs. 7.37 crores as composition charges, Rs. 54,72,889 as labour cess and Rs. 55,282 on account of administrative charges. That the company succumbed to the undue pressure and on 13.01.2016 deposited Rs. 7.37 crores with DTCP as composition charges and further requested for release of its building plans. The company on 13.01.2016 further deposited an amount of Rs.41,68,171/- towards the balance labour cess.
- l. That even after clearing the dues of EDC/IDC and payment of composition charges, building plan was not released by DTCP, instead, the company was asked to apply for sanction of building plan again as per the new format. The same was duly done by the company on 16.06.2017. Further, the company, on completion of construction applied for grant of occupation certificate on 29.07.2017. That the company on the very next day i.e., 25.10.2017 replied to the DTCP justifying the concern while submitting the building plan again for approval. In the meantime, the company also paid composition charges to the tune of Rs.43,63,127/- for regularization of construction of the project.
- m. That, finally on 12.01.2018 the building plan was approved for the Centra One, post approval of the same, the company on 21.05.2018, in continuation to its application dated 31.07.2017, again requested DTCP for grant of occupation certificate for its project. It is stated that occupation certificate was duly granted by DTCP on 09.10.2018. Thus, even after having paid the entire EDC dues in the year 2010 the building plans for the project in question was not

released by DTCP. It is reiterated that release/approval of building plan at that point in time was not linked with payment of EDC.

- n. It is pertinent to mention that in 2013 the company received a surprise demand of Rs.7.37 crores for composition towards unauthorized construction without considering the fact that construction at the project site was carried out by the company on the basis of approval of building plan in the meeting of the building plan approval committee on 21.07.2008. Even after payment of the composition charges, the building plan was not released by DTCP instead, the company was asked to apply for sanction of building plan again as per the new format. The same was duly done by the company on 16.06.2017. However, it is after almost a lapse of 10 years from the date of first application that the building plan was finally approved on 12.01.2018. Thus, the circumstances as mentioned hereinabove falls squarely into the definition and applicability of the concept of 'force majeure'.
- o. That in addition to the above, the project also got delayed due to a complete ban on extraction of ground water for construction by the Central Ground Water Board. On 13.08.2011, the Central Ground Water Board declared the entire Gurgaon district as 'notified area' which in turn led to restriction on abstraction of ground water only for drinking / domestic use. Hence, the developer/company had to use only treated water for construction and/or to buy water for construction.
- p. That the *Hon'ble Supreme Court recently in Puri Constructions Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Dr. Viresh Arora (Civil Appeal No. 3072 of 2020)* on 3rd September 2020 while allowing the appeal preferred by the Developer company against an order passed by the Ld. NCDRC



directed the Ld. Commission to decide afresh on the matter in issue while taking into consideration the force majeure circumstances pleaded by the developer.

- q. The Hon'ble Supreme Court conceded with the submissions made by the Developer Company that though the NCDRC noted that the developer pleaded force majeure on the ground that
- i. the construction of the flats could not proceed due to a stay granted by the National Green Tribunal on construction during the winter months; and
 - ii. demonetization affected the real estate industry resulting in delays in completion, the submission has not been dealt with
- r. The second submission which was urged on behalf of the developer was that in similar other cases, the NCDRC has condoned the delay of the nature involved in the present case in handing over possession, having regard to the quantum of delay involved.
- s. Thus, delay, if any, in handing over possession to allottees of Centra One has been due to reasons beyond control of the company and the same need to be taken into consideration by RERA in so awarding delay possession compensation while also giving the company an extension of 10 years so as to complete the project by 2018-19.
12. As far as this issue is concerned the authority the authority has already settled this issue in complaint bearing no. **1567 of 2019** titled as ***Shruti Chopra & anr. V/s Anjali Promoters & Developers Pvt. Ltd.*** wherein the authority is of the considered view that if there is lapse on the part of competent authority in granting the required sanctions within reasonable time and that the respondent was not at fault in fulfilling the conditions of obtaining required approvals then the respondent should



approach the competent authority for getting this time period i.e., 31.12.2011 till 19.11.2018 be declared as "zero time period" for computing delay in completing the project. However, for the time being, the authority is not considering this time period as zero period and the respondent is liable for the delay in handing over possession as per provisions of the Act.

G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainant

G.I. The respondent shall be directed to pay the interest for the delayed period of handing over the possession from the time as stated under clause (Za) of section 2.

G.II. The Respondent shall also be directed to pay interest for the period of complaint, pending before the Real Estate Regulatory Authority as it was an obligation cast upon him under the act to provide and pay the interest automatically under the act. The Respondent failed to pay the interest when demanded.

G.III. The Respondent shall be ordered to recalculate the interest to be charged or already charged at the same rate of interest at which he is ordered to pay to the allottee i.e. @State Bank of India highest marginal cost of lending rate plus (2%) two percent.

13. In the present complaint, the complainant intends to continue with the project and is seeking delayed possession charges interest on the amount paid. Clause 24 of the allotment letter (in short, agreement) provides for handing over of possession and is reproduced below: -

"That company shall endeavor to make offer of possession of the said building/shop/office space/unit by 31 December 2011, subject to force majeure circumstances and compliance of all terms and conditions and timely payment of all installments by the allottees of the building. If the company fails to make offer of possession for



fit outs latest by 30th June 2012, the company shall pay a compensation as mentioned in space buyers' agreement up till the date of making offer possession of the said premises. If the company has applied to DTCP/any other competent authority for issuance of occupation and/or completion certificate by 30 April 2012 and the delay, if any, in making offer of possession by 30th June 2012 is attributable to any delay on part of DTCP/ competent authority, then the possession may be delayed, and company shall not be liable to pay any compensation or penalty for the delay. The company, on obtaining certificate for occupation and use from the competent authorities, subject to clearance of all your dues and your compliance with all the terms and conditions of the application/allotment and standard space buyer's agreement to be executed, shall hand over the shop/office space/unit....."

14. 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 application, 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 favor 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 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.



15. **Admissibility of grace period:** The promoter has proposed to hand over the possession of the apartment by 30.06.2012. Since in the present matter the allotment letter incorporates unqualified reason for grace period/extended period in the possession clause. Accordingly, the authority allows grace period of 6 months to the promoter being unqualified at this stage.
16. **Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** 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
17. 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.
18. 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., **08.04.2022** is 7.30%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 9.30%.



19. 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;"

20. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainant shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 9.30% by the respondent/promoter which is the same as is being granted to the complainant in case of delayed possession charges.
21. On consideration of the documents available on record and submissions made regarding contravention of 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 24 of the allotment letter issued to the complainant on 08.09.2010, the possession of the subject apartment was to be delivered by 30.06.2012. As far as grace period is concerned, the same is allowed being unqualified and as far as force majeure note is concerned the authority has not considered that period as zero period accordingly the due date of possession remains the same. The respondent has offered the possession of the subject apartment on



- 12.12.2018. Accordingly, it is the failure of the respondent/promoter to fulfil its obligations and responsibilities as per the agreement to hand over the possession within the stipulated period.
22. 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 was granted by the competent authority on 09.10.2018. The respondent offered the possession of the unit in question to the complainant only on 12.12.2018, 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. This 2 month of reasonable time is being given to the complainant keeping in mind that even after intimation of possession, practically they have 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., 30.06.2012 till the expiry of 2 months from the date of offer of possession (12.12.2018) which comes out to be 12.02.2019.
23. 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 allottee shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay from due date of possession i.e., 30.06.2012 till the date of offer of the possession of the unit plus two months i.e., till 12.02.2019, at prescribed rate i.e., 9.30 % p.a. as per proviso to section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules.



However, the amount of assured return already paid by the respondent-developer shall be adjusted towards the interest at the prescribed rate for every month of delay payable by the respondent as per proviso to section 18(1) of the Act.

G.IV. Respondent shall be directed to provide a copy of the occupation certificate or application for obtaining occupation certificate along with mandatory documents annexed with such application.

24. The occupation certificate for the above project is already granted by the competent authority which is annexed at annexure R/5 page 37 of the reply.

G.V. Respondent shall be directed to provide a copy of declaration made by the promoter under all sub clause of clause (1) of sub section (2) of section 4.

G.VI. Respondent shall be directed to provide a copy of registered declaration w.r.t. common area, parking area, carpet area, super area etc. made by the respondent to the competent authorities as required under the law.

G.VII. The extra money charged on account of parking charges, club housing charges and such other incidental charges be refunded back to the complainant along with interest.

G.VIII. The respondent shall be directed to comply with the drawings and approved plans sanctioned by the competent authority and inform the complainant about the non-compliance of promises made to the complainant if any.

G.IX. The Respondent shall be restrained from making threatening demands of the pending dues once the complaint regarding interest etc. is pending before the authorities under the act.



25. The above-mentioned reliefs were withdrawn by the counsel for the complainant during proceedings.

G.X. The Respondent shall be ordered not to charge any holding charges, interest on the pending payments at the time of offer of handing over the possession after the settlement of dues as per RERA Act

26. 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 shall not be entitled to any holding charges though it would be entitled to interest for the period the payment is delayed.

G.XI. Respondent shall be directed to get the conveyance deed of common areas and super areas be made in the name of association of allottees.

27. As per the provisions of the Act and Rules the promoter is directed to do the needful.

G.XII. Respondent should pay to complainant the costs of litigation and legal expenses @ Rs. 50,000/-.

28. The complainant is 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



complainant may file a separate complaint before Adjudicating Officer under section 31 read with section 71 of the Act and rule 29 of the rules.

H. Directions of the authority

29. Hence, the authority hereby passes this order and issue the following directions under section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance of obligations casted upon the promoters as per the functions entrusted to the authority under section 34(f):

- i. The respondent is directed to pay interest at the prescribed rate of 9.30% p.a. for every month of delay from the due date of possession i.e., 30.06.2012 till the date of offer of the possession plus two months i.e., 12.02.2019. The arrears of such interest accrued from 30.06.2012 till 12.02.2019 shall be paid by the promoter to the allottee within a period of 90 days from date of this order.
- ii. However, the amount of assured return already paid by the respondent-developer shall be adjusted towards the interest at the prescribed rate for every month of delay payable by the respondent as per proviso to section 18(1) of the Act.
- iii. The complainant is directed to pay outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment of interest for the delayed period.
- iv. 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 promoters shall be liable to pay the allottee, in case of default i.e., the delayed possession charges as per section 2(za) of the Act.
- v. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainant which is not the part of the agreement. However, holding charges shall not be charged by the promoter at any point of time even after



HARERA
GURUGRAM


Complaint No. 2114 of 2019

being part of agreement as per law settled by Hon'ble supreme court
in civil appeal no. 3864-3889/2020.

30. Complaint stands disposed of.
31. File be consigned to registry.


(Vijay Kumar Goyal)

Member


(Dr. K.K. Khandelwal)

Chairman

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 08.04.2022



HARERA
GURUGRAM