

BEFORE ADJUDICATING OFFICER, RERA
BENGALURU, KARNATAKA

Represented by K.PALAKSHAPPA

Adjudicating Officer

Complaint No. CMP/190108/0001831

Date: 13th MAY 2019

Complainant : SIREESHA PADMINI
No. 101, # G H Paradise, 1st Lane,
19th Cross, 5th Block, HBR Layout,
Bangalore – 560043.

AND

Opponent : Om Prakash Yadav
Supertech Micasa,
Supertech Limited
Supertech House, B- 28-29,
Sector 58, Noida, Ghaziabad,
Uttar Pradesh- 201301.

J U D G E M E N T

1. Sireesha Padmini, has filed this complaint under Section 31 of RERA Act against the project “Supertech Micasa” developed by Supertech Limited, bearing Complaint no. CMP/190108/0001831. The facts of the complaint is as follows:

“Have booked the flat by taking home loan and savings of last 10 years, but unfortunately procession is not given until now, there is a delay of almost 19 months and still no clarity by when the possession will be given. Will be happy if total refund is done of whatever amount is paid and cancel the booking of my flat.”


Devi
13/05/19

Relief Sought from RERA: Refund of the amount paid for the flat."

2. In pursuance of the summons issued by the authority on behalf of the complainant his brother-in-law was present on 08/02/2019. Shri Bellad Advocate has filed vakalath on behalf of the developer. Time has been taken for conciliation as per Section 32(g) of the Act but later it was failed. Therefore the developer has filed Objection Statement.
3. I have heard the arguments on 30/04/2019 and reserved for judgment.
4. The relief sought by the complainant is for refund of entire amount which was strongly opposed by the developer on the ground that the authority not only meant for granting the relief on complaints but also to regularize the real estate business. Shri Bellad Advocate submits that if all the consumers go on demanding for refund of the amount the real estate business will fall on the ground. Further he submitted that the developer has constructed the apartment with a hope that the construction will take the same for their purpose. He has built the project on the amount invested by the consumer. In case the consumers are permitted to withdraw the amount, the purpose of real estate business will be defeated. Hence, the developer has requested the authority to dismiss the complaint.

D. Bellad
13/02/19

5. It is his submission that the project has been implemented in 2014 with an intention to provide luxurious apartment to the consumer. The complainant has entered into agreement with free will. He has also drawn my attention that as per clause 33 of the agreement 15% of the total consideration will be deducted. Under these backgrounds, now I would like to go through the complaint of the complainant.
6. As per Sec. 18 the complainant is entitled for refund of amount as the developer has failed to provide the goods as agreed by him. Of course now the developer has submitted to the authority that he will deliver the flat on or before 30 June 2019. Now we are in the month of May. Hardly one and half months is left. Therefore the submission has been rightly made by the learned counsel of developer to consider subject to delivery of possession on or before 30th June 2019.
7. Generally it is the wish of the complainant to take a decision on his own. But however the submission made by the learned counsel for the developer is also to be looked into. Of course, the developer had already promised to the complainant that he will complete the project on or before February 2017. Later he had promised that he will complete the project in the year 2018 but even today also it is not completed. However it is submitted that by the end of June 2019 he will provide the flat as agreed with the complainant. It is also true that the complainant has paid the amount and waiting for the goods which is not taken place even after 5 years.



13/05/19

8. By taking into consideration of all these aspects I would like to say that the complainant has to wait till 30th June 2019 and till then the complainant is entitled for the delay compensation. IN case the developer failed to deliver the flat on or before June 2019 the complainant may go for refund of his amount in accordance with S.18 of the Act. My finding is supported by the HRERA decision in his complaint NO. 161/2018 where in the HRERA has made the observation as under.

However keeping in view the present status of the project and intervening circumstances, the authority is of the view that in case refund is allowed in the present complaint, it shall hamper the completion of the project at the project is almost complete and the respondent has committed to handover the possession of the said unit by 31st December 2018. The refund of deposited amount will also have adverse effect on the other allottees in the said project. Therefore, keeping in view the principles of natural justice and in Public Interest, the relief sought by the complainants cannot be allowed.

Though this decision is an independent one, the principle is taken into consideration.

9. AS per S.71 (2) RERA, the complaint shall be closed within 60 days from the date of filing. In this case the Complaint was filed on 08/01/2019. As per the SOP, 60 days be computed from the date of appearance of parties. In this case the parties have appeared on 08/02/2019. Hence, there is delay in closing the complaint. With this observation I proceed to pass the order.


13/05/19


ORDER

The Complaint No. CMP/190108/0001831 is allowed.

- a. Directing the developer to pay delay compensation in the form of interest @10.75%P.A on the amount paid by him from March 2017 till the possession is delivered.
- b. In case the developer fails to deliver the possession on or before June 2019 the developer shall refund the entire amount paid by the complainant with interest as prescribed under Rule 16.
- c. The developer shall pay Rs. 5,000/- as cost of the petition.

Intimate the parties regarding this order.

(Typed as per dictation Corrected, Verified and pronounced on 13/05/2019)


(K.PALAKSHAPPA)
Adjudicating Officer