

REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, BIHAR

Before the Single Bench of Mrs. Nupur Banerjee

Complaint Case No. RERA/CC/893/2021

Ranjusha Keshri W/o Late Anant Kumar Suman.....Complainant

M/s DDL Infratech Pvt. Ltd.....Respondent

Project: Agrani First City

For Complainant: In Person

**For Respondent: Mr. Rabindra Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Shiv Kumar, M.D.**

12/10/2022

ORDER

The matter was last heard on 24-08-2022.

1. This complainant petition has been filed seeking relief to direct the respondent to provide physical possession of land .
2. In short, the case of the complainant is that the respondent has executed the Deed of Absolute Sale for the plot, admeasuring 2400 sq. ft. on the consideration amount of Rs. 3.50 lakh and as per the agreement, the respondent has assured to hand over the physical possession of the plot with development within 1 year, but the same has been not handed over to complainant with development. Hence, this complaint.
3. Perused the record of the case. The respondent has filed their objection/ reply to the application of complainant dated 18-07-2022, admitting therein that complainant booked plot and accordingly the sale deed executed but as the farmer not provided the land, the respondent couldn't hand over the physical possession of the plot. It has been further submitted that alternative plots were shown by respondent but as the complainant was not interested in shown alternative plot, the same is allotted to other allottee. Further, the respondent submitted their objection regarding the calculation of interest filed by the complainant.

4. On 20-08-2022, complainant has filed affidavit stating therein that alternative plot shown is not in compatible to earlier booked plot no.15A, hence, he prayed for the refund of the amount paid along with interest as per the market rate.
5. On 12-10-2022, complainant filed an application stating that total Rs.8 lakh has been paid to respondent in lieu of booked plot and out of which receipts of Rs.7.80 lakh has been issued by the respondent which is already submitted and receipts of Rs. 20,000/-, paid to respondent is not issued by respondent.
6. During the last hearing, the complainant has submitted that on 19th June, 2022, the complainant was directed to visit the site and the respondent has shown the plot but he is not ready to take the plot. He further submitted that he wants refund of the money with interest. He further submitted that he has already filed an affidavit for refund of the amount.

Learned counsel for the respondent has submitted that they are ready to refund the amount. Order for refund may be passed.

The Bench observes that the Project was applied for registration but was not approved due to map not approved by the competent authority and liberty was given to apply a fresh with the map getting approved from the competent authority, hence, the project was registrable as per 1st Proviso of Section 3(1) of the Act. The Hon'ble Supreme Court recently in M/s Newtech Promoters & Developers Pvt. Ltd. Vs State of U.P & Ors. [2022] (1) RCR (Civil) 357 has observed that the Act is not retrospective in nature, rather it is retroactive because it affects the existing rights of the persons mentioned in the Act like promoter, allottee etc. The intent of legislature was to include all ongoing projects which commenced prior to the enforcement of the Act and this project was also an ongoing project as evident from the documents placed.

Further, In Lavasa Corporation Limited v/s Jitendra Jagdish Tulsiani & Others, Second Appeal (Stamp) Nos. 9717 of 2018 & 18465 of 2018, 18467 of 2018 with Civil Application Nos. 683 of 2018, 791 of 2018, 792 of 2018, the Hon'ble Bombay High court has observed that RERA has brought on Statute Book to ensure greater accountability towards the consumers and significantly reduce frauds and delays, as

also the current high transaction costs. It attempts to balance the interests of consumers and promoters, by imposing certain responsibilities on both. It seeks to establish symmetry of information between the promoter and purchaser, transparency of contractual conditions and set minimum standards of accountability and a fast-track dispute resolution mechanism. The RERA, as stated in its 'Objects and Reasons', was enacted for inducting professionalism and standardization in the sector, thus, paving the way for accelerated growth and investments in the long run.

Hence, the Bench finds that the present Complaint Case falls within the ambit of RERA Act, 2016 to entertain and therefore, maintainable against the Respondent.

In the light of the documents placed, submissions made by the parties and considering the prayer of complainant for refund as made in the affidavit dated 20-06-2022 as well as during the last hearing, the Bench hereby directs the respondent company and its directors to refund the entire principal consideration amount paid to the complainant along with interest at the rate of marginal cost of fund based lending rate (MCLR) of State Bank of India as applicable for three years plus three percent from the date of deposit of the consideration amount till the date of refund within sixty days of issue of this order.

With these directions and observations, this complaint petition is disposed of.

Sd/-

Nupur Banerjee
Member