

**BEFORE TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY**

*[Under the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016]*

**Complaint No. 370 of 2025**

**Dated: 30<sup>th</sup> December 2025**

**Quorum:**

**Dr. N. Satyanarayana, IAS (Retd.), Hon'ble Chairperson**

**Sri K. Srinivasa Rao, Hon'ble Member**

**Sri Laxmi Narayana Jannu, Hon'ble Member**

**1. Mrs. Anasuya Suseela Nunna**

**2. Mr. Ravi Kiran Nunna**

*R/o Flat No. 202, Plot No. 533, Om Nilayam,  
Matrusri Nagar, Miyapur, Hyderabad, Telangana - 500049*

*...Complainant*

*Versus*

**M/s. Vasavi Realtor LLP,**

*Rep by its Designated Partner, Vijay Kumar Yerram,  
Vasavi Corporate,  
H.No.8-2-703/7/1 and 8-2-703/7/1/A,  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Vasavi Corporate Building, Amrutha Valley Apartments,  
Road No. 12, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad, Telangana - 500034*

*...Respondent*

The present matter filed by the Complainant herein came up for final hearing on 18.07.2025 before this Authority in presence of Complainant and the Respondent. Upon perusing the material on record and on hearing arguments of both the parties and having stood over for consideration till this day, the following order is passed:

**ORDER**

2. The present Complaint has been filed by the Complainant under Section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as the “Act”) read with Rule 34(1) of the Telangana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as the “Rules”) seeking appropriate relief(s) against the Respondents.

**A. The brief facts of the case, as stated by the Complainant, are as follows:**

3. The Complainant states that he entered into an Agreement of Sale with the Respondent in October 2021, for purchase of Flat No. 0710 in Tower 3, West Wing of the project “Vasavi Lake City – West,” having RERA Registration No. P02500001819 and situated at Manjeera Pipeline Road, APGOs Cooperative Housing Society, Hafeezpet, Hyderabad. The Complainant

submits that bulk payment of the entire consideration was made upfront and proof of payments are placed on record. As per the Agreement of Sale, possession was to be delivered on or before August 2023.

4. It is submitted that despite the contractual commitment, the flat has not been handed over even as of June 2025, with a delay of nearly two years. The Respondent has repeatedly extended possession dates without clarity or accountability. The Complainant states that he was given assurance at the time of purchase that the project would not be affected by the COVID-19 pandemic as it was already behind them, and that handover would be completed by August 2023 with a grace period of six months.

5. The Complainant alleges that despite these assurances, the project has faced unjustified delays. The Respondent has on several occasions cited vague reasons and postponed delivery. In one discussion, it was indicated that financial mismanagement of funds was the cause of delay. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent claimed to have secured finance from Sundaram Finance to complete the project but even thereafter, deadlines continued to be postponed without firm commitment, thereby raising further anxiety among allottees.

6. It is further stated that although the Complainant continued to trust the Respondent and sought to resolve issues amicably, each inquiry resulted only in new dates and assurances without tangible progress at the site. Having already paid the entire amount, the Complainant has been left in a state of uncertainty and financial distress, with plans and investments severely affected.

7. The Complainant submits that over the past year the Respondent has repeatedly revised possession timelines. After a meeting in September 2024, possession was promised by February 2025, later pushed to March 2025, and most recently revised to August 2025. Looking at the pending works, the Complainant contends that even this timeline appears unrealistic. The Respondent has provided no reliable updates, instead giving repeated false assurances. From the progress reports, it is evident that the delay is due to operational and financial mismanagement, not due to the pandemic. The Complainant points out that his Agreement of Sale was executed post-pandemic (October 2021) when no COVID-related delays were disclosed, yet the Respondent has sought RERA extensions citing pandemic impact.

8. It is further stated that deviations have been noticed in the construction, especially reduction in balcony sizes, altered plumbing lines that reduced utility space, and restrictions in

operability of doors from the kitchen. Although the issue was raised in meetings and the Respondent assured rectification, no steps have been taken till date.

9. The Complainant contends that by collecting 100% of the flat cost and failing to deliver possession within the agreed time, the Respondent has violated RERA provisions and breached contractual obligations. The delay has caused financial strain, mental stress, and emotional hardship.

10. The Complainant submits that despite repeated follow-ups, the Respondent has shown resistance to engage meaningfully and has failed to provide a clear completion schedule. The continuing delay without justification amounts to violation of statutory and contractual obligations, and intervention of this Hon'ble Authority is therefore sought.

#### **B. Relief(s) Sought:**

11. Accordingly, the Complainant sought the following reliefs:

- i. Direct the Respondent to complete the construction and hand over possession of the flat at the earliest, as the agreed timeline including the six-month grace period has already expired, and to ensure that the remaining work is completed within a fixed and enforceable timeframe.
- ii. Interest on the entire amount already paid, in accordance with Section 18 of the Act, to be calculated from the originally promised possession date of August 2023 under the Agreement of Sale dated October 2021, until the actual date of handover.
- iii. Compensation for deviations from the agreed plan under the Agreement of Sale, particularly the loss of space in the balconies and utility area, and the inadequate opening between the kitchen and utility area.
- iv. Compensation for the mental distress, harassment, and financial strain caused by the Respondent's continuous delays and false assurances, which have disrupted the Complainant's personal and professional life.

#### **C. Counter filed by the Respondent:**

12. It is submitted by the Respondent that the complaint is not maintainable either in law or on facts and is liable to be dismissed. It is submitted that the complainant has not followed the remedies available under the Agreement for Sale for resolution of disputes before

approaching this Hon'ble Authority. Further, no prior legal notice was issued before filing this complaint, which itself renders the application defective and not maintainable.

13. It is submitted that the project “Lake City-West” was developed lawfully after obtaining rights from the landowners under registered documents, covering 43,298.17 sq. yds. While requisite land conversion permissions and building permissions for construction of multi-storied apartments were obtained on 07.02.2020. The project consists of seven towers (cellars + ground + 14 upper floors) and a clubhouse (stilt + five upper floors). The project was duly registered with this Authority vide Registration No. P02500001819 dated 20.03.2020.

14. It is further submitted that the Complainant was allotted an apartment in the project with apartment No. W.030710 on the 7th Floor of Tower 3, admeasuring 1915 sq. ft., along with parking, for a total consideration of Rs.1,00,76,150/-. The Agreement of Sale sets out the carpet area, balcony/veranda area, common area, and undivided share of land. The Complainant has paid Rs.87,90,000/- towards the sale consideration, while the balance amount remains payable in accordance with the agreed payment schedule.

15. It is submitted that as per Clause 7 of the Agreement, the Respondent was obligated to hand over possession of the flat and common areas by 31.08.2023, subject to extension in the event of force majeure. The Agreement itself clearly records that timely delivery is the essence of the contract but also recognises that the period of completion shall stand extended to the extent of delay caused by force majeure conditions, during which period the allottee is not entitled to claim compensation.

16. It is submitted that the complainants have not come before this Hon'ble Authority with clean facts but with an ulterior motive to make unlawful gain and that there has been material suppression of facts of the case with regard to the claim and the relief sought therein.

17. It is further stated that COVID-19 is a force majeure event duly recognized under law, and hence the timelines stood extended. The Respondent contended that the COVID-19 pandemic, subsequent lockdowns, and migration of labourers had severely impacted construction work. The Respondent further relies on the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Suo Motu Writ Petition No. 3 of 2020*, whereby the period from 15.03.2020 till 28.02.2022 was excluded for the purposes of computation of limitation across various statutes. It is

contended that the extension of time for completion of the project was not only factually justified but also recognised in law.

18. In addition to COVID-19, the Respondent submits that unforeseen site conditions such as rocky terrain requiring manual excavation further delayed the project. Owing to restrictions on blasting due to the residential nature of the surrounding locality, excavation could only be done manually, which compounded the delay. These challenges were communicated to all allottees through regular updates and meetings.

19. The Respondent also submits that certain third-party disputes adversely impacted the project timelines. These include cases such as RERA Case No. 190/2020, W.P. Nos. 2694/2021, 13898/2022, 33433/2023, W.A. No. 584/2023, SLP Nos. 9694–9695/2023, and W.P. No. 26301/2024, some of which are still pending. While most have been resolved, their pendency at various points of time hindered the smooth progress of the project.

20. It is contended that the project has been executed strictly in accordance with approved plans and specifications, and any clerical or typographical errors in the Agreement of Sale cannot be construed to create liability. It is the case of the Respondent that more than 90% of the project construction is completed and the project is presently in its final finishing stage. An extension of registration has already been granted by this Authority till 07.02.2026, within which period the Respondent undertakes to deliver possession of the apartments to all allottees. Communications have also been issued to purchasers for payment of balance amounts, as completion is nearing.

21. With regard to the claims for interest and compensation, the Respondent submits that in view of the force majeure conditions, no such relief is available to the Complainant under law. Section 6 of the Act specifically contemplates force majeure events such as natural calamities and other circumstances beyond the control of the promoter. The Respondent submits that the COVID-19 pandemic, together with the extraordinary circumstances outlined above, clearly falls within the scope of force majeure.

#### **D. Rejoinder filed by the Complainant:**

22. The Complainant submits that the assertions made in the reply filed by the Respondent are untenable, misleading, and designed only to deflect attention from their own defaults. The allegation that the present complaint has been filed merely to harass or to claim damages is

categorically denied. The Agreement of Sale dated 25.10.2021 was executed between the Complainant and the Respondent for Flat No. W030710, West Wing Tower 3, 7th floor, 10 series. At the time of execution, COVID-19 was not an unforeseeable event. The pandemic and lockdowns had already passed and the Respondent expressly assured the Complainant of timely possession. The attempt now to rely on COVID-19 or force majeure as an excuse for non-performance is an afterthought and a diversionary tactic.

23. The Respondent's contention that the possession date of 31st August 2023 was a "clerical mistake" is equally unsustainable. Both parties entered into a registered agreement with full knowledge of the scale and nature of the project. No corrigendum or rectification was executed, nor was any error ever pointed out until this complaint was filed. The Respondent's attempt to disregard the agreed possession date after default amounts to misrepresentation and fraud within the meaning of Section 17 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, and cannot absolve them of their contractual obligations. A party cannot take advantage of its own wrong, and the Respondent's internal lapses or alleged oversights cannot negate the binding terms of the Agreement of Sale.

24. The objection regarding maintainability is misconceived. Section 31 of the RERA Act grants any aggrieved allottee an unconditional right to file a complaint directly before this Hon'ble Authority without any precondition of issuing a legal notice. The RERA Act is a special legislation enacted to protect the rights of homebuyers and provides a summary and efficacious remedy against promoters' defaults. The Agreement of Sale does not and cannot restrict the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Authority. Hence, the contention that the complaint is not maintainable is legally unsustainable and deserves to be rejected.

25. The reliance placed by the Respondent on the Hon'ble Supreme Court's suo motu order in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 3 of 2020 is wholly misplaced. That order pertained to extension of limitation periods for judicial and quasi-judicial filings; it did not extend or suspend contractual performance timelines. Having voluntarily entered into an agreement on 25.10.2021, the Respondent cannot now claim pandemic-induced delay as a defence. The force majeure clause in the Agreement is also of no assistance to the Respondent. No notice was ever issued invoking the clause, no amendment to the Agreement was executed, and no justification was notified either to the Authority or to the Complainant, as required under Section 6 of the RERA Act. A retrospective invocation is legally untenable.

26. The Respondent's assertion that 90% of the construction is complete and that the Complainant should pay the remaining 10% and proceed for registration is false and misleading. The Complainant has not received any valid demand notice, nor has any Occupancy Certificate or possession letter been issued. As per Schedule C of the Agreement of Sale, nearly 88% of the consideration had already been paid at the time of booking in 2021, with the balance 10% payable only at the time of registration. It is a settled principle under Section 17(1) of the RERA Act that a conveyance deed can be executed only after obtaining an Occupancy Certificate. In the present case, mandatory clearances such as Occupancy Certificate, Fire NOC, and utility connections have not been produced. The Respondent's demand for registration without such approvals is premature, illegal, and amounts to misrepresentation.

27. The Respondent's reliance on the project-level RERA extension from February 2025 to February 2026 is also untenable. No corresponding amendment was made to the Agreement of Sale, nor was the Complainant informed or consulted. The Respondent cannot unilaterally alter contractual timelines by relying on an extension granted at project level. Until and unless a revised agreement is executed, the possession date stipulated in the Agreement of Sale remains binding and enforceable.

28. The attempt to deny liability for delay by citing force majeure or site-related construction difficulties such as manual rock blasting is equally misconceived. The Complainant never agreed, orally or in writing, to any such extensions. Knowledge of site conditions is part of the promoter's risk and cannot be a ground to avoid liability. The Complainant has suffered significant hardship, including financial strain from paying rent and EMIs simultaneously, disruption of family life and planning, and constant stress caused by repeated false assurances. Compensation and interest as sought are not arbitrary but arise directly from the Respondent's defaults and continued non-performance.

29. In light of the above, the Complainant prays that this Hon'ble Authority may reject the Respondent's justifications based on COVID-19, force majeure, or alleged clerical error, and hold the Respondent bound to the terms of the Agreement of Sale dated 25.10.2021. The Complainant further prays that the Respondent be directed to complete all pending work and adhere to statutory requirements for obtaining mandatory clearances, and thereafter hand over possession of the apartment at the earliest. The Complainant also prays for award of interest under Section 18 of the RERA Act for the delay period, along with compensation for mental

agony, inconvenience, and financial loss. The Complainant seeks such other orders as this Hon'ble Authority may deem just and proper in the circumstances of the case.

#### **E. Points for Consideration**

30. Upon a careful perusal of the record and the submissions advanced by both parties, oral as well as written, this Authority is of the view that the following issues arise for determination in the present complaint:

1. Whether the present complaint is maintainable before this Authority?
2. Whether the Complainants are entitled to the reliefs as prayed for?

#### **F. Observations of the Authority:**

##### **Point 1:**

31. The Respondent has raised an objection as to the maintainability of the present complaint on the ground that the Complainants failed to first resort to the contractual dispute resolution mechanism envisaged in the Agreement of Sale, namely an amicable settlement by mutual discussion, prior to approaching this Authority. The Authority finds this objection untenable for the following reasons:

32. The relevant Dispute Resolution clause in the Agreement of Sale is reproduced below for ready reference:

*“33. Dispute Resolution clause in the Agreement of sale executed between the parties, the said clause stated that all or any disputes arising out of touching upon or in relation to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, including the interpretation and validity of the terms thereof and the respective rights and obligations of the Parties, shall be settled amicably by mutual discussion, failing which the same shall be settled through adjudication officer appointed under the Act.”*

33. It is clear from the above that the clause only requires the parties to attempt an amicable settlement by mutual discussion. Such a clause is at best directory and cannot oust or restrict the statutory jurisdiction of this Authority.

Section 79 of the RE(R&D) Act expressly bars the jurisdiction of Civil Courts in respect of any matter which this Authority, the Adjudicating Officer, or the Appellate Tribunal is empowered to determine. Likewise, Section 88 clarifies that the provisions of the RE(R&D) Act are in addition to, and not in derogation of, other laws. Thus, the intention of the legislature is that remedies under this beneficial legislation must remain open to allottees, irrespective of any private clause for amicable settlement.

34. Even in cases where agreements contained arbitration clauses (which is not the case here), the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Hon'ble NCDRC have consistently held that such clauses cannot circumscribe the jurisdiction of consumer fora or statutory authorities constituted under special enactments.

35. In *National Seeds Corporation Ltd. v. M. Madhusudhan Reddy* (2012) 2 SCC 506, the Supreme Court held that remedies under special statutes are in addition to, and not in derogation of, other remedies. For ready reference, the relevant extract is reproduced below:

\*“49. *Support to the above view is also lent by Section 79 of the recently enacted Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (for short "the Real Estate Act").*

*Section 79 of the said Act reads as follows:-*

*'79. Bar of jurisdiction - No civil court shall have jurisdiction to entertain any suit or proceeding in respect of any matter which the Authority or the adjudicating officer or the Appellate Tribunal is empowered by or under this Act to determine and no injunction shall be granted by any court or other authority in respect of any action taken or to be taken in pursuance of any power conferred by or under this Act.' It can thus, be seen that the said provision expressly ousts the jurisdiction of the Civil Court in respect of any matter which the Real Estate Regulatory Authority, established under Subsection (1) of Section 20 or the Adjudicating Officer, appointed under Subsection (1) of Section 71, or the Real Estate Appellate Tribunal established under Section 43 of the Real Estate Act, is empowered to determine. Hence, in view of the binding dictum of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *A. Ayyaswamy (supra)*, the matters/disputes, which the Authorities under the Real Estate Act are empowered to decide, are non-arbitrable, notwithstanding an Arbitration Agreement between the parties to such matters, which, to a large extent, are similar to the disputes falling for resolution under the Consumer Act.*

*56. Consequently, we unhesitatingly reject the arguments on behalf of the Builder and hold that an Arbitration Clause in the afore-stated kind of Agreements between the Complainants and the Builder cannot circumscribe the jurisdiction of a Consumer Fora, notwithstanding the amendments made to Section 8 of the Arbitration Act."*

36. Similarly, in *Aftab Singh & Ors. v. Emaar MGF Land Ltd. & Ors.* (Consumer Case No. 701 of 2015, decided on 13.07.2017), it was held that arbitration clauses in builder-buyer agreements cannot oust the jurisdiction of consumer fora. The said view was later upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal Nos. 23512–23513 of 2017. The relevant para reads:

*"25. This Court in the series of judgments as noticed above considered the provisions of Consumer Protection Act, 1986 as well as Arbitration Act, 1996 and laid down that complaint under Consumer Protection Act being a special remedy, despite there being an arbitration agreement the proceedings before Consumer Forum have to go on and no error committed by Consumer Forum on rejecting the application. There is reason for not interjecting proceedings under Consumer Protection Act on the strength an arbitration agreement by Act, 1996. The remedy under Consumer Protection Act is a remedy provided to a consumer when there is a defect in any goods or services. The complaint means any allegation in writing made by a complainant has also been explained in Section 2(c) of the Act. The remedy under the Consumer Protection Act is confined to complaint by consumer as defined under the Act for defect or deficiencies caused by a service provider, the cheap and a quick remedy has been provided to the consumer which is the object and purpose of the Act as noticed above."*

37. In the present matter, there is only a clause requiring amicable discussion before invoking remedies. Such a clause is directory at best, and cannot override or defeat the statutory right of the Complainant to approach this Authority under the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. Accordingly, this Authority has no hesitation in holding that the Complainant is well within its rights to approach this forum without being first compelled to pursue an amicable settlement under the Agreement. The objection of the Respondent as to maintainability is therefore rejected.

**Point No. 2:**

38. The Complainants have sought relief on the ground that there has been an inordinate delay in handing over possession of the subject flat. It is the case of the Complainants where Agreement of Sale was executed on 25.10.2021 between the parties, clearly stipulated that possession of the subject flat would be handed over by 31.08.2023, with a grace period of six months, ending on 28.02.2024. The Respondent has failed to hand over possession even as on date. Further, although the project was registered with TG RERA up to February 2025 and later extended until 07.02.2026, the project remains incomplete.

39. The Complainants submit that the Respondent has repeatedly given false assurances of completion, while allottees continue to suffer. The Respondent, conversely, attributes the delay to the Covid-19 pandemic, claiming force majeure, citing the nationwide lockdown beginning March 2020, the impact on migrant labour, and consequential delays. The Respondent further cites rocky terrain at the site, third-party disputes, and typographical errors in the possession date as additional justifications.

*(i) Whether the Covid-19 pandemic can be taken as a valid shield by the Respondent in the present case?*

40. This Authority finds no merit in such a contention. The Agreement of Sale was executed on 25.10.2021, well after the onset and subsiding of the Covid-19 pandemic. Having consciously undertaken such commitment, the Respondent cannot now, with retrospective justification, rely on Covid-19 as a defence to escape its contractual and statutory obligations. Such conduct clearly amounts to holding out false assurances with mala fide intent.

41. It is a settled principle that once a promoter has chosen to register a project and enter into binding contractual commitments with allottees, he does so with full knowledge of the risks, constraints, and challenges of the market. At the time of entering into the Agreement of Sale with the present Complainant, the Respondent was already aware of the Covid-related disruptions, as well as the Government notifications granting moratoriums for project completion timelines. Despite this knowledge, the Respondent chose to provide a specific assurance of delivery by 31.08.2023 and six months of grace period.

42. This Authority aligns with the observations of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in *Neelkamal Realtors Suburban Pvt. Ltd. &Anr. vs. Union of India &Ors. [2017 SCC OnLine Bom 9302]*, wherein at para 119 it was categorically observed:

*"While the proposal is submitted, the Promoter is supposed to be conscious of the consequences of getting the project registered under RERA. Having sufficient experience in the open market, the Promoter is expected to have a fair assessment of the time required for completing the project...".*

43. The above dictum fortifies the principle that the promoter, being structurally at an advantageous position with respect to project information and market realities, is under a statutory duty to provide realistic timelines. The framework of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 reinforces this obligation by mandating timely completion and possession within the period stipulated in the Agreement of Sale.

44. Therefore, the plea of Covid-19 as a force majeure defence in the present case is wholly untenable. The Respondent, having executed the Agreement of Sale in the year 2021 with specific possession timelines, cannot now seek to retrospectively attribute delays to the pandemic. Accordingly, this Authority holds that the reliance on Covid-19 as a shield stands rejected.

### *iii) Extension of Registration*

The Respondent has further contended that, since extensions have been granted by this Authority, the project timeline now stands extended up to February 2026, and therefore possession shall be delivered by then. The Complainants, however, have questioned the validity and effect of such extensions.

45. At the outset, it must be clarified that under the scheme of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

*"An Act to establish the Real Estate Regulatory Authority for regulation and promotion of the real estate sector and to ensure sale of plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, or sale of real estate project, in an efficient and transparent manner and to protect the interest of consumers in the real estate sector and to establish an adjudicating mechanism for speedy dispute redressal and also to establish the Appellate Tribunal to hear appeals from the decisions,*

*directions or orders of the Real Estate Regulatory Authority and the adjudicating officer and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.”*

46. The paramount objective is twofold: protection of consumer interest, and ensuring completion of projects in an efficient manner. Denial of extension during the Covid-19 disruption would have resulted in projects being stalled, to the grave prejudice of allottees. It was in this context that this Authority, balancing the equities, granted extensions in line with the moratoriums issued by Telangana RERA:

1. 15.03.2020 to 14.09.2020 (Circular No.14 dated 13.05.2020),
2. 15.09.2020 to 15.03.2021 (Order No.15 dated 29.09.2020),
3. 15.03.2021 to 14.09.2021 (Order No.16 dated 01.06.2021).

47. Accordingly, an aggregate 18 months' extension was applied across projects to safeguard larger consumer interest. However, it is equally well settled that such regulatory extensions cannot dilute the contractual rights of individual allottees under their respective Agreements of Sale, nor can they displace the statutory rights flowing from Section 18 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

48. In the present matter, it is evident that the Respondent has unilaterally revised possession timelines first to February 2024, and thereafter to February 2026 due to the extension taken without consultation or consent of the Complainants. Such unilateral revisions are impermissible. The Hon'ble Bombay High Court in *Neelkamal Realtors Suburban Pvt. Ltd. vs. Union of India &Ors. [2017 SCC OnLine Bom 9302]*, while upholding the constitutional validity of RERA, categorically observed:

**Para 119** “The RERA does not contemplate rewriting of contract between the flat purchaser and the promoter.”

**Para 256** of this Judgment further clarifies that “by giving opportunity to the promoter to prescribe fresh timeline under Section 4(2)(l)(C), he is not absolved of the liability under the agreement for sale”

49. The above dicta makes it abundantly clear that any extension granted by the Authority, or revised timelines uploaded on the TG RERA project registration portal, do not ipso facto alter or bind the allottees' contractual rights. The agreed date of possession remains as

stipulated in the Agreement for Sale, and unilateral extensions by the promoter cannot be foisted upon allottees to their detriment.

50. Accordingly, this Authority holds that the revised possession dates mentioned by the Respondent, whether while seeking extensions before the Authority or as updated on the registration portal, cannot be treated as binding on the Complainants.

***(iii)Relief under Section 18 of the RE(R&D) Act:***

51. It is observed as per the records furnished before this Authority that the entire sale consideration is for an amount of Rs. 1,00,76,150/- (Rupees One Crore Seventy Six Thousand One Hundred and Fifty Only) however, the Complainant upon the mutual agreement between the Complainant as well as the Respondent has paid an amount of Rs. 87,90,000/- (Rupees Eighty Seven Lakh And Ninety Thousand Only). The Agreement of Sale unequivocally stipulates that possession was to be delivered by 31.08.2023, with a grace period of six months, i.e., up to 28.02.2024. Admittedly, possession has not been delivered within the stipulated period.

52. The Respondent's contention that 90% work is complete and that the Complainants have paid only a portion of the consideration is wholly unsustainable. The Complainants have already paid over 90% of the agreed consideration as per their averments. Despite receiving such substantial sums, the Respondent has failed to honour its contractual obligations. It is manifest that the Respondent gave false assurances, being fully conscious of the market situation, yet assuring dates of completion that it had no capacity to honour. More than months has elapsed beyond the stipulated date, yet the project is neither complete nor possession handed over.

53. The Respondent further seeks to shift the burden on the complainant by contending that the balance amount is unpaid. This plea is untenable. The law does not permit a defaulter to take advantage of its own breach. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kusheshwar Prasad Singh v. State of Bihar [Civil Appeal No. 7357 of 2000]***:

*"It is settled principle of law that a man cannot be permitted to take undue and unfair advantage of his own wrong to gain favourable interpretation of law. It is sound principle that he, who prevents a thing from being done shall not avail himself of the*

*non-performance he has occasioned. To put it differently, "a wrongdoer ought not to be permitted to make a profit out of his own wrong."*

54. In this context, it is pertinent to note that the Agreement of Sale linked the payment schedule to the progress of construction. While the allottees are indeed bound to adhere to the agreed payment plan, such obligation arises only when the promoter simultaneously fulfils its reciprocal obligation of executing construction in line with the assured progress. In the absence of such progress, the Respondent cannot insist upon further payments as a condition to claim relief.

55. Section 18 of the RE(R&D) Act is categorical and unconditional. It does not make the grant of interest contingent upon the quantum of sale consideration paid, nor does it provide any defence to a defaulting promoter. Once delay in handing over possession is established, an allottee who elects to remain in the project is entitled to interest for every month of delay, irrespective of whether part or whole of the consideration has been paid, provided that the payments already made are in accordance with the Agreement of sale. The Respondent's plea that only partial sale consideration has been paid and hence interest cannot be granted is therefore vague, misconceived, and contrary to the express mandate of the statute.

Now, Section 18 of the RE(R&D) Act is categorical:

*"(1) If the promoter fails to complete or is unable to give possession of an apartment, plot or building,—*

*(a) in accordance with the terms of the agreement for sale or, as the case may be, duly completed by the date specified therein; or*

*(b) due to discontinuance of his business as a developer on account of suspension or revocation of the registration under this Act or for any other reason, he shall be liable on demand to the allottees, in case the allottee wishes to withdraw from the project, without prejudice to any other remedy available, to return the amount received by him in respect of that apartment, plot, building, as the case may be, with interest at such rate as may be prescribed in this behalf including compensation in the manner as provided under this Act:*

*Provided that where an allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, he shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay, till the handing over of the possession, at such rate as may be prescribed.*

(2) *The promoter shall compensate the allottees in case of any loss caused to him due to defective title of the land, on which the project is being developed or has been developed, in the manner as provided under this Act, and the claim for compensation under this subsection shall not be barred by limitation provided under any law for the time being in force.*

(3) *If the promoter fails to discharge any other obligations imposed on him under this Act or the rules or regulations made thereunder or in accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement for sale, he shall be liable to pay such compensation to the allottees, in the manner as provided under this Act."*

56. This statutory right of allottee is unqualified and absolute. Attention is drawn to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India **in Civil Appeal Nos. 3581-359 of 2022, Civil Appeal Diary No. 9796/2019, M/s Imperia Structures Limited vs. Anil Patni & Others**, wherein it was held:

*"In terms of Section 18 of the RERA Act, if a promoter fails to complete or is unable to give possession of an apartment by the date specified in the agreement, the promoter would be liable, on demand, to return the amount received in respect of that apartment if the allottee wishes to withdraw from the project. Such a right of the allottee is 'without prejudice to any other remedy available to him'. This right is unqualified, and if availed, the deposited money must be refunded with interest as prescribed. The proviso to Section 18(1) contemplates that if the allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, they are entitled to interest for every month of delay until possession is handed over. The allottee may proceed under Section 18(1) or the proviso thereto."*

57. Similarly, in **Civil Appeal Nos. 6745-6749 of 2021, M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Private Limited vs. State of UP & Others**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed:

*"Section 18(1) of the Act spells out the consequences if the promoter fails to complete or is unable to give possession of an 9 of 10 apartment, plot, or building in terms of the agreement for sale. The allottee/home buyer holds an unqualified right to seek a refund of the amount with interest as prescribed."*

58. Further, as earlier observed, the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in *Neelkamal Realtors Suburban Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India [(2017) SCC Online Bom 9302]* clarified that RERA registration or its extension cannot rewrite the contract between parties. The date assured under

the Agreement of Sale, executed with the allottee's consent, shall prevail. Thus, the Respondent is bound by Section 11(4)(a) of the RE(R&D) Act, which mandates adherence to the terms of the Agreement of Sale.

59. At the same time, if the Complainant has indeed defaulted in adhering to the payment schedule, the Respondent is not without remedy. Sections 19(6) and 19(7) of the Act confer upon the promoter a right to claim interest for delayed payments, as per Rule 15 of the Telangana RE(R&D) Rules, 2017. Nevertheless, such entitlement shall be subject to the Respondent producing cogent and substantive documents demonstrating both the stage-wise progress of construction and the corresponding default, and not merely based on unilateral assertions.

60. In the present case, this Authority finds the Respondent in clear breach of both statutory and contractual obligations. The Complainant is therefore entitled to interest at the prescribed rate for the entire period of delay, i.e., from 01.03.2024 until the actual date of handing over possession. As regards claims of compensation, this Authority notes that jurisdiction for adjudicating compensation lies with the Adjudicating Officer under Section 71 of RE(R&D) Act with Form 'N'. The Complainant is at liberty to pursue such remedy separately.

61. Accordingly, while the Complainant is entitled to relief under Section 18 of the RE(R&D) Act, this entitlement is subject to the reciprocal statutory duty of the Complainant to discharge any outstanding amounts under the payment plan, if not already paid. Compliance on both sides is essential to ensure balance of obligations and timely delivery.

62. This Authority cannot remain oblivious to the larger pattern of violations. It is noted with grave concern that more than fifty complaints have already been received against this very Respondent in respect of the subject project. Such repeated defaults and false assurances strike at the very root of the confidence that homebuyers are entitled to repose under the protective framework of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

63. The Statement of Objects and Reasons of the RE(R&D) Act explicitly emphasizes "*greater accountability towards consumers and to inject transparency, efficiency, and discipline in the real estate sector*". The conduct of the Respondent herein is in gross

derogation of that legislative mandate. If such violations are permitted to persist, the very soul of the Act would stand diluted and the protection promised to allottees rendered illusory.

64. Accordingly, this Authority hereby sternly warns the Respondent promoter that any further default, non-compliance, or failure to deliver possession within the assured statutory timelines or any fresh grievances brought to notice by allottees shall invite invocation of Section 63 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

65. This Authority shall not hesitate to take the strictest view in future, for the Act was enacted not as a mere regulatory framework but as a beneficial legislation to protect innocent homebuyers from the very malaise exemplified by the conduct of this Respondent.

66. The Respondent is hereby directed to complete the project and hand over possession to the Complainants within the stipulated period. It is further clarified that if the Complainants have defaulted in making payments as per the agreed schedule, the Respondent shall be entitled under Section 19(6) of the Act to claim interest on such delayed payments, provided that it substantiates such claim with credible documentary evidence of both construction progress and corresponding default.

67. In the event the Complainants have defaulted in making payments as per the agreed schedule, the Respondent shall be entitled, under Section 19(6) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, to claim interest on such delayed payments in accordance with Rule 15 of the Telangana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017. Nevertheless, such entitlement shall be subject to the Respondent producing cogent and substantive documents demonstrating both the stage-wise progress of construction and the corresponding default, and not merely based on unilateral assertions.

68. The Complainants are, in turn, directed to discharge any balance amounts due under the agreed payment schedule, if not already paid. Mutual compliance is essential to ensure timely completion and delivery of the project.

***G. Directions of the Authority:***

69. In view of the findings and observations recorded hereinabove, this Authority proceeds to issue the following directions:

- a) The preliminary objection raised by the Respondent regarding the maintainability of the complaint on account of the Dispute Resolution Clause in the Agreement of Sale stands rejected. The complaint is maintainable before this Authority.
- b) The Respondent's reliance on the Covid-19 pandemic as a ground of force majeure is held untenable, since the Agreement of Sale was executed after the subsiding of the pandemic and with full knowledge of the prevailing circumstances.
- c) The extension of registration taken by this Respondent cannot dilute the contractual rights of the Complainant under the Agreement of Sale. The date of possession as stipulated in the Agreement shall prevail.
- d) The Respondent is held liable for failure to hand over possession of the subject flat by the agreed date i.e., 28.02.2024 (inclusive of grace period).
- e) The Complainants are entitled to interest at the rate of 10.70% per annum (being SBI MCLR + 2% as per Rule 15 of the TG RE(R&D) Rules, 2017), computed on the amounts actually paid by the Complainants, with effect from 01.03.2024 until actual handing over of lawful possession. The exact computation shall be subject to verification of such payments by the Respondent at the stage of effecting payment. The Respondent shall pay the arrears accrued up to the date of this Order within sixty (60) days, and shall thereafter continue to pay the accruing interest on a monthly basis, on or before the 10th day of each succeeding month, until possession is delivered.
- f) Insofar as compensation is concerned, the Complainant is at liberty to pursue appropriate proceedings before the Learned Adjudicating Officer under "Form N".
- g) The Respondent is hereby directed to complete the project forthwith and hand over possession to the Complainants within the statutory timelines.
- h) The Complainants are directed to pay the balance consideration strictly in accordance with the agreed payment schedule. In the event of any default in adhering to such schedule, the Respondent shall be at liberty to claim interest on the delayed amounts, as provided under Rule 15 of the Telangana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017. However, such claim shall be substantiated by valid documentary evidence demonstrating that the default is aligned with the actual stage-wise progress of construction, and not merely on the basis of unilateral assertions.

70. Having regard to the repeated defaults and the large number of complaints already pending against this Respondent in the same project, this Authority sternly warns the Respondent that any further delay, non-compliance, or grievance brought to notice by allottees shall invite section 63 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

71. The Complaint is accordingly allowed in part, in terms of the above directions.

72. Failure to comply with above said directions by the Respondent shall attract penalty in accordance with Section 63 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

73. As a result, the Complaint is disposed of accordingly. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

**Sri K. Srinivasa Rao,**  
Hon'ble Member,  
TG RERA

Sd/-

**Sri Laxmi Narayana Jannu,**  
Hon'ble Member,  
TG RERA

Sd/-

**Dr. N. Satyanarayana, IAS (Retd.),**  
Hon'ble Chairperson,  
TG RERA

