

THE U.P. REAL ESTATE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, LUCKNOW

Division Bench Court No. 1

**IA-1260/2024
IN
Appeal/572/2020**

LUCKNOW DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

.....Appellant

Versus

AVDHESH KUMAR SHUKLA

.....Respondent

Counsel for Appellant

Counsel for Respondent

Hon'ble Mr. Justice (Dr.) D.K. Arora, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. Sanjai Khare, Judicial Member

This is an application filed by the respondent for release of amount deposited by the Lucknow Development Authority towards compliance of Section 43 (5) of the Act 2016 in favour of respondent on the grounds that the appeal of the Lucknow Development Authority has been dismissed vide order dated 17.03.2023 for want of prosecution and till filing of application for release of amount deposited by the appellant, no application for recall of the said order i.e. order dated 17.03.2023 has been filed by the appellant.

Dr Azhar Ikram, learned counsel for the respondent submitted that though the application for release of amount in favour of the respondent has been filed, however, in the interest of justice, the amount be sent to the Regulatory Authority for releasing in favour of respondent during the execution proceedings.

Now the issue to be decided is as to what should be done of the pre-deposit made by the appellant/promoter in compliance of the provisions of Section 43(5) of the Act in case of dismissed appeal.

The aims and objects of the Act provide for regulation and promotion of the real estate sector in an efficient and transparent manner and to protect the interests of the consumers in real estate sector. Proviso to Section 43(5) of the Act specifically provides that where a promoter files an appeal with the Appellate Tribunal, it shall

not be entertained without the promoter first having deposited with the Appellate Tribunal at least 30% of the penalty, or such higher percentage as determined by the Appellate Tribunal, or the total amount to be paid to the allottee including interest and compensation imposed on him before the said appeal is heard. The intent of the legislature is quite clear from the wording of proviso to Section 43(5) of the Act that the interest of the consumers i.e. allottees/buyers be protected.

The intent of the legislature in laying down the provision of pre-deposit of the amount of penalty or any other amount payable to the allottee by the promoter before the appeal can be heard in the Appellate Tribunal, has been elucidated by the **Hon'ble Apex Court in paragraph 127** of its judgment in the **Civil Appeal Numbers 6745-6749 of 2021 M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. Vs. State of UP** and others, the same reads as under:-

“127. It may further be noticed that under the present real estate sector which is now being regulated under the provisions of the Act 2016, the complaint for refund of the amount of payment which the allottee/consumer has deposited with the promoter and at a later stage, when the promoter is unable to hand over possession in breach of the conditions of the agreement between the parties, are being instituted at the instance of the consumer/allottee demanding for refund of the amount deposited by them and after the scrutiny of facts being made based on the contemporaneous documentary evidence on record made available by the respective parties, the legislature in its wisdom has intended to ensure that the money which has been computed by the authority at least must be safeguarded if the promoter intends to prefer an appeal before the tribunal and in case, the appeal fails at a later stage, it becomes difficult for the consumer/allottee to get the amount recovered which has been determined by the authority and to avoid the consumer/allottee to go from pillar to post for recovery of the amount that has been determined by the authority in fact, belongs to the allottee at a later stage could be saved from all the miseries which come forward against him.”

The Hon'ble Apex Court has clearly held that the legislature in its wisdom intended to ensure that the money which has been computed by the Authority at least must be safeguarded if the promoter intends to prefer an appeal before the Tribunal and in case, the appeal fails at a later stage, it should not be difficult for the consumer/allottee to get the amount recovered which has been determined by the Authority. It is in order to avoid the consumer/allottee to go from pillar to post for recovery of the amount that has been determined by the Authority, that the legislature has in its wisdom laid the condition of pre-deposit by the promoter under Section 43(5) of the Act.

Section 40(1) of the Act of 2016 provides for a mechanism for recovery of interest or penalty or compensation and enforcement of orders etc. of the A.O. or the Regulatory Authority, or the Appellate Tribunal and the same shall be recoverable in such manner as may be prescribed as an arrears of land revenue. The **Hon'ble Apex Court** vide **paragraph 140** in **M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. Vs. State of UP** (supra) was pleased to observe that:-

“140. It is settled principle of law that if the plain interpretation does not fulfill the mandate and object of the Act, this Court has to interpret the law in consonance with the spirit and purpose of the statute. There is indeed a visible inconsistency in the powers of the authority regarding refund of the amount received by the promoter and the provision of law in Section 18 and the text of the provision by which such refund can be referred under Section 40(1). While harmonizing the construction of the scheme of the Act with the right of recovery as mandated in Section 40(1) of the Act keeping in mind the intention of the legislature to provide for a speedy recovery of the amount invested by the allottee along with the interest incurred thereon is self explanatory. However, if Section 40(1) is strictly construed and it is understood to mean that only penalty and interest on the principal amount are recoverable as arrears of land revenue, it would defeat the basic purpose of the Act.”

As can be seen from the above observations, Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that even the principal amount invested by the allottee can be recovered as arrears of land revenue under Section 40(1) of the Act. It is further clarified by Hon'ble Supreme Court that the intention of the legislature is to provide a mechanism for early recovery of the amount invested by the allottee alongwith the interest incurred thereon.

Rule 23 of the U.P. Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2016 provides that subject to the provisions of Section 40(1), the recovery of the amounts due as arrears of land revenue shall be carried out in the manner provided in the local laws. As Rule 23 has been framed under the provisions of Section 40(1) of the Act, the observations of Hon'ble Supreme Court on Section 40(1) shall equally apply to Rule 23 of the Rules 2016.

Although Section 40(1) of the Act of 2016 gives powers to the Appellate Tribunal to enforce its decisions, but the Tribunal does not have adequate infrastructure and the required sufficient human resource to determine and certify the amount due from the appellant/promoter to be paid to the respondent/allottee.

It is our considered view that as per provisions of the Act and as per the observations made by the Hon'ble Apex Court, it is the duty of the Tribunal to arrange to transfer the pre-deposited money to the concerned allottee/consumer in case the promoter's appeal is dismissed. However, since the promoter might not have paid the full payable amount or there being a prospect of some amount having already been recovered from the promoter under execution proceedings at the level of the Authority or AO, it is just and lawful that the Tribunal transfers the amount to the Authority for transferring the same to the allottee/consumer after due diligence at its end and to recover any additional amount which could be due to be paid by the promoter; or return to the promoter any amount that could be in excess of the entitlement of the allottee/consumer.

The calculation of the exact amount due to be paid to the respondent/allottee normally is to be determined up to the date of actual payment. As the facts and figures are available with the Regulatory Authority, which is executing its or A.O's original order, therefore, due diligence is required while calculating the amount payable, interest thereon, as well as verification of the payments made by the allottee from time to time, etc.

In the instant case, the appeal No. 572/2020, of the Lucknow Development Authority has been **dismissed** vide order dated 17.03.2023 for want of prosecution and no application for recall of said order has been filed by the promoter till filing of application by the respondent for release of amount in favour of respondent. We, therefore, direct the Registry to transfer the entire amount deposited by the appellant/promoter under the provisions of Section 43(5) of the Act to the concerned account of the U.P. Real Estate Regulatory Authority (U.P. RERA). Further, we direct the Regulatory Authority to dispose of this amount during the execution proceedings in accordance with its order dated 08.07.2019.

It will be the liability of the beneficiary to pay the income tax on the interest earned on the deposited amount, if any.

The application of the respondent (IA No. 1260/2024) is accordingly **disposed** of.

(Sanjai Khare)

(D.K. Arora)

Dated: 08.05.2024
MANSINGH