

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition for Special Leave to Appeal (C) Nos.1861-1871/2022

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 14-12-2021 in DBCWP No. 13688/2021 14-12-2021 in DBCWP No. 13758/2021 14-12-2021 in DBCWP No. 13768/2021 14-12-2021 in DBCWP No. 13774/2021 14-12-2021 in DBCWP No. 13775/2021 14-12-2021 in DBCWP No. 13801/2021 14-12-2021 in DBCWP No. 13817/2021 14-12-2021 in DBCWP No. 13823/2021 14-12-2021 in DBCWP No. 13825/2021 14-12-2021 in DBCWP No. 13857/2021 14-12-2021 in DBCWP No. 13864/2021 passed by the High Court Of Judicature For Rajasthan At Jaipur)

UNION BANK OF INDIA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

RAJASTHAN REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY  
& ORS. ETC. ETC.

Respondent(s)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.17453/2022-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT )

Date : 14-02-2022 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.R. SHAH  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE B.V. NAGARATHNA

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Tushar Mehta, SG  
Mr. O. P. Gaggar, AOR  
Mr. Aditya Gaggar Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Ritin Rai, Sr. Adv.  
Ms. Liz Mathew, AOR  
Mr. Navneet R , Adv.  
Mr. Mohit Khandelwal, Adv  
Ms. Gunjan Mathur, Adv

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

We have heard Shri Tushar Mehta, learned Solicitor General appearing on behalf of the petitioner/Bank and Shri Ritin Rai, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of one of the respondents/Caveator/one of the home buyers.

We are in complete agreement with the view taken by the High Court by which the High Court has ultimately concluded in para

contd..

36, as under -

"36. Our conclusions can thus be summarised as under:-

(i) Regulation 9 of the Regulations of 2017 is not ultra vires the Act or is otherwise not invalid.

(ii) The delegation of powers in the single member of RERA to decide complaints filed under the Act even otherwise flows from Section 81 of the Act and such delegation can be made in absence of Regulation 9 also.

(iii) As held by the Supreme Court in the case of Bikram Chatterji (supra) in the event of conflict between RERA and SARFAESI Act the provisions contained in RERA would prevail.

(iv) RERA would not apply in relation to the transaction between the borrower and the banks and financial institutions in cases where security interest has been created by mortgaging the property prior to the introduction of the Act unless and until it is found that the creation of such mortgage or such transaction is fraudulent or collusive.

(v) RERA authority has the jurisdiction to entertain a complaint by an aggrieved person against the bank as a secured creditor if the bank takes recourse to any of the provisions contained in Section 13(4) of the SARFAESI Act."

However, it is clarified that para 36(v) reproduced hereinabove shall be applicable in a case where proceedings before the RERA authority are initiated by the home buyers to protect their rights. With this, the Special Leave Petitions are dismissed.

Pending application(s) shall stand disposed of.

(NEETU SACHDEVA)  
COURT MASTER (SH)

(NISHA TRIPATHI)  
BRANCH OFFICER