

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

Complaint no.:	834 of 2019
First date of hearing:	11.09.2019
Date of decision:	08.04.2022

1. Aerik Sharma
2. Vinita Lal
**Both RR/o 485/7 Mool Chand Bhawan, New Railway
Road, OPP. Krishna Bajaj, Gurugram**

Complainants

Versus

M/s Anjali Promoters & Developers Pvt. Ltd.
Office address: M-11, Middle Circle, Cannaught Circus,
New Delhi-110001

Respondent

CORAM:

Dr. K. K. Khandelwal
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal

**Chairman
Member**

APPEARANCE:

Sh. Sushil Yadav (Advocate)
Sh. Venkat Rao (Advocate)

Complainants
Respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated 01.03.2019 has been filed by the complainants/allottees 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 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.	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	Sailexpo Overseas Pvt. Ltd.
6.	RERA registration details	Not Registered
7.	Unit no.	FF-2B, First floor [pg. 18 of complaint]
8.	Unit measuring	485.45 sq. ft. [pg. 18 of complaint]
9.	Date of execution of flat buyer agreement	09.06.2010 [pg. 14 of complaint]
10.	Possession clause	Clause 2 Possession <i>2.1 The possession of the said Premises shall be endeavored to be delivered to the intending Purchaser by 31st December 2011, however, subject to clause 9 herein and strict adherence to the terms and conditions of this agreement by the Intending Purchaser. The intending Seller shall give Notice of possession to the Intending Purchaser with regard to the date of handing over of possession, and in the event the intending purchaser fails to accept and take the possession of the said Premises on such Date specified in the notice to the intending Purchaser shall be deemed to be custodian of the said Premises from the date indicated in the notice of possession and the said Premises</i>



		<p>shall remain at the risk and cost of the intending Purchaser.</p> <p>2.2 The intending Purchaser shall only be entitled to the possession of the said Premises after making full payment of the Consideration and other charges due and payable. Under no circumstances shall the possession of the said premises be given to the intending Purchaser unless all the payments in full, along with interest due, if any, have been made by the intending purchaser to the intending seller. However, subject to full payment of consideration along with interest by the intending purchaser, if the Intending Seller fails to deliver the possession of the said Premises to the Intending Purchaser by June 2012, however, subject to clause 9 herein and adherence to the terms and condition of this agreement by the intending Purchaser, then the Intending Seller shall be liable to pay penalty to the intending Purchaser @ Rs.15/- per sq. ft. per month up till the date of handing over of said Premise by giving appropriate notice to the Intending Purchaser in this regard. If the intending seller 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 June 2013 is attributable to any delay on part of DTCP/ competent authority, then the Intending Seller shall not be required to pay any penalty under this clause.</p> <p><i>(Emphasis supplied)</i></p> <p><i>[pg. 23 of complaint]</i></p>
11.	Due date of possession	30.06.2012 [Note: Grace period included]
12.	Total sale consideration as per statement of account annexed with offer of possession dated 19.11.2018	₹43,34,990 /- <i>[pg. 70 of reply]</i>



13.	Amount paid by the complainant as per statement of account annexed with offer of possession dated 19.11.2018	₹34,77,940/- [pg. 70 of reply]
14.	Delay in handing over possession till the date of offer of possession plus two months i.e., 19.01.2019	6 year 6 months 20 days
15.	Occupation certificate	09.10.2018
16.	Offer of possession for unit no. FF-27 on first floor	19.11.2018 [pg. 46 of complaint]

B. Facts of the complaint

3. The complainants have pleaded the complaint on the following facts:

- a. The complainants have submitted that the respondent gave advertisement in various leading newspaper about their forthcoming project name "Centra One" at Sector 61, Gurgaon promising various advantages, like world class amenities and timely completion of the project etc. Relying on the promise and undertakings given by the respondent in the aforementioned advertisements the complainants booked a commercial space admeasuring 485.45 sq. ft. in aforesaid project of the respondent for total sale consideration is Rs. 43,34,990/- which includes BSP, car parking, IFMS, PLC etc. They made payment of Rs. 34,77,940/- to the respondent vide different cheques on different dates, the details of which are as annexed. As per buyers' agreement the respondent had allotted a unit no. 27 on 1st floor admeasuring 515 sq. ft. in the "Centra one" to them. As per para no. 2.1 of the builder buyer

- agreement, the respondent had agreed to deliver the possession of the flat by 31.12.2011.
- b. The complainant regularly visited the site but was surprised to see that construction work was very slow in progress and no one was present at the site to address their queries. It appears that respondent has played fraud upon them. The only intention of the respondent was to take payments for the project without completing the work. Despite receiving the payment as demands raised by the respondent for the said space and despite repeated requests and reminders over phone calls and personal visits of the complainants, the respondent has failed to deliver the possession of the allotted space to them within stipulated period.
- c. The complainant visited the site but are shocked to see that construction was going on very slow speed then they contacted the respondents through mails and personal visit, about the project but the respondent did not give any satisfactory answer and they had paid Rs. 34,77,940/- by then as and when demanded by the respondent but the construction was going on at a very slow speed and even the respondent did not know that when they will be able to deliver the project and lastly on dated 19.11.2018 the respondent sent the offer of possession letter to the complainant.
- d. That due to this omission on the part of the respondent the complainant had been suffering from disruption, mental torture, agony and also continues to incur severe financial losses. They booked this unit for the purpose of his office of consultant and planned to start the office in the year 2013 but due to omission on the part of the respondent the complainants incur sever financial losses. This could be avoided if the respondent had given possession

of the space on time. As per clause 2.2 of the space buyer agreement dated 09.06.2010 it was agreed by the respondent that in case of any delay, the respondent shall pay to the complainants a compensation @Rs. 15/- per sq. ft. per month of the super area of the space. It is, however, pertinent to mention here this is unjust and the respondent has exploited the complainants by neither providing the possession of the unit even after a delay. The respondent cannot escape the liability merely by mentioning a clause in the agreement. It could be seen here that the respondent has incorporated the clause in one sided buyers' agreement and usurp such a huge amount of the complainant.

- e. The complainants have requested the respondent several times on making telephonic calls and also personally visiting the office of the respondent to refund the amount along with interest @18% per annum on the amount deposited by them complainants, but respondent has flatly refused to do so. Thus, the respondent in a pre-planned manner defrauded them with his hard-earned huge amount and wrongfully gain himself and cause wrongful loss to them.

C. Relief sought by the complainants:

4. The complainants have sought following relief:
 - a. Direct the respondent to give prescribed interest per annum from the date of promissory date of delivery of the commercial space in question.
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. It is submitted that the complainants have 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 misrepresenting they 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 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 ta the threshold without any further adjudication.
 - b. It is submitted that from the bare perusal of the complaint, it is ascertained that the complainants have failed an incomplete complaint before this hon'ble authority and should be dismissed on this short point alone. It is submitted that the complainants in their complaint have made reference of various documents but has failed to annex the same. It is further submitted that the respondent seeks liberty to file appropriate additional reply and substantiate the same with counter documentary proof at the time of arguments.
 - c. The complainants have alleged that the respondent has delayed the project and in terms of the SBA whereby the respondent had agreed to handover possession by 31.12.2011, there has been a huge delay, however it is clarified that the possession timelines as per clause 2.1 of the SBA dated 09.06.2010 were subject to clause 9 and strict adherence to the terms and conditions of the agreement. In the

context, 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 respondent launched the project with a vision of creating an iconic building and hence, engaged the best professionals in the field for the same who are well known for their timely commitment as well. The respondent had conceived that the project would be deliverable by 31.12.2011 based on the assumed cash flows from the allottees of the project. However, it was not in the contemplation of the respondent that the allottees including the complainants herein would hugely default in making payments and hence, cause cash flow crunch in the project. The complainants were also aware that as per the SBA, timely payment of the installments was the essence of the contract, however demand raise vide offer of possession is outstanding till date. The complainants, in view of the fact that they have relied upon clause 2.1 of the SBA for the timelines, it is submitted that the said timelines for possession till 31.12.2011 were subject to compliance of all terms and conditions of the agreement, including but not limited to timely payment of all the dues. A further grace period of 6 months was also agreed to between the parties. As stated above, other allottees including the complainants hugely defaulted in making timely payments of the various installments and despite grant of numerous opportunities, failed to clear dues. Hence, the timelines for possession stood diluted because of the acts/defaults of the various allottees.



- d. It is further submitted that the project "Centra One" is a Greenfield project, located at Sector 61, Gurgaon. All customers including the complainant were well informed and conscious of the fact that timely payment of all the demands was of essence to the contract. Majority of customers opted for construction linked payment plan after clearly understanding that and agreed upon to tender the payment as per the construction milestones. It is pertinent to mention here that, given the choice of payment plan and terms of the agreement, all the customers including the complainant specifically understood that a default in tendering timely payment by significant number of customers, would delay the construction activity. It is a matter of fact and record that the unit holder as a group have defaulted in making timely payment which has cause major set-back to the development work. It is submitted that in the 1st year demands amounting to Rs. 20.84 crores were raised by the respondent in accordance with the payment plans chosen by customer, and only Rs. 15.83 crores were paid by the customers. Over 43% customers defaulted in making timely payment in FY2007, and percentage of defaulting customers swelled to 56%, 40% and 68% in the FY 09,10 and 11 respectively. It is noteworthy to mention here that, with the sole intention of completing the project within reasonable time, the respondent offered additional benefit of timely payment discount which was not in the contemplation of the respondent while launching the project and hence, cause further outflow of funds, just to seek timely payments from the customer. In fact, in May 2009, the respondent offered some discounts and incentives to its customers.
- e. It is further evident that the customers as a group defaulted in making timely payments, which obviously had a rippling effect on



the development of the project and hence, the possession timelines also stood diluted accordingly. Further, in view of the same, the complainants are not liable to demand any delay penalty when he himself has hugely defaulted in making timely payment. It is further submitted that in case the complainants wants to withdraw the booking of the unit in question, the same shall be governed by the duly agreed clauses of the agreement executed between both the parties.

- f. It is however pertinent to point out that the construction of the project as well as the unit in question is complete. The respondent has received occupation certificate on 09.10.2018, in accordance to which the respondent vide its letter dated 09.10.2018, in accordance to which the respondent vide its letter dated 19.11.2018 has already served OOP letter to the complainants thereby requesting them to clear the outstanding dues and complete the documentation in order to initiated the process of physical handover of possession of the unit in question. As a goodwill gesture, the respondent further after issuance of OOP letter, has also granted special credit discount amounting to Rs. 7,08,800/- to the complainants with regard to the said unit.
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 theses 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.1. 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. FF-27 in the commercial project of the respondent company, Centra One, situated in Gurugram, Haryana. The complainants in the present complaint are 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 complainants.
- 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 concurred 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 complainants

G.I. Direct the respondent to give prescribed interest per annum from the date of promissory date of delivery of the commercial space in question.

13. In the present complaint, the complainants intend to continue with the project and is seeking delayed possession charges interest on the amount paid. Clause 2.1 of the agreement to sell (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 2.1 of the buyer's agreement was signed between the parties on 09.06.2010, 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 19.11.2018. 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 complainants only on 19.11.2018, so it can be said that the complainants 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 (19.11.2018) which comes out to be 19.01.2019.

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 19.01.2019, 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.

H. Directions of the authority

24. 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., 19.01.2019.

- ii. The arrears of such interest accrued from 30.06.2012 till 19.01.2019 shall be paid by the promoter to the allottee within a period of 90 days from date of this order.
 - 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 being part of agreement as per law settled by Hon'ble supreme court in civil appeal no. 3864-3889/2020.
25. Complaint stands disposed of.
26. File be consigned to registry.


(Vijay Kumar Goyal)

Member


(Dr. K.K. Khandelwal)

Chairman

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 08.04.2022