

Before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (RETD.)
appointed to hear objections/representations in the matter of PACL Ltd.
as so referred to in the order dated 15/11/2017, of the Hon'ble Supreme Court
passed in civil appeal no. 13301/2015 titled Subrata Bhattacharya vs SEBI and
duly notified in SEBI Press release no. 66 dated 08/12/2017.

File no. 364/1

MR NO. 5185-15, 5186-15, 5190-15

Objector : Pankaj Gupta and another

Present : Ms. Akanksha Nehra, Advocate (Enrolment No. KAR/1710/2012)

Order :

1. It may be noticed at the outset that vide order dated 02/02/2016, passed in civil appeal no. 13301/2015 bearing the title Subarata Bhattacharaya Versus Securities & Exchange Board Of India, the Hon'ble supreme court had directed constitution of a committee by SEBI to be headed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.M. Lodha. former Chief Justice of India as its Chairman for disposing off the land purchased by PACL so that the sale proceeds recovered there from can be paid to the investors who have invested their funds in the company for purchase of the land. The said committee was asked to collect relevant record including title sale deeds from the CBI (Central Bureau of Investigation) if it is in possession of any documents.
2. The committee on its part has put up various properties including the property forming the subject matter of the present objection petition, for auction sale on its website www.auctionpacl.com.
3. This objection petition relates to Flat Nos. 1707, 1708 and 1709 situated on the 17th Floor, building no. 21, Samartha Angan-1, S.S.S.P. Oshiwara East Unit No. 1, CHS Ltd., Off Link Road, Oshiwara, Andheri (W), Mumbai which stand attached under orders of the committee for auction/sale. The objectors contend that the above described property was earlier purchased by M/S PGF Limited through registered sale deed dated 25/08/2009 from M/S Samartha Development Corporation and from whom the objectors

ACW
26/2/18

above named have purchased the above properties vide three registered agreements of sale all dated 12/12/2011 for amounts as detailed here under:-

| Agreement Dated | Flat No. | Consideration |
|------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| 12-12-2011 | 1708 | Rs. 69,16,000/- |
| 12-12-2011 | 1709 | Rs. 83,98,000/- |
| 12-12-2011 | 1707 | Rs. 45,89,000/- |


4. The certified copy dated 23/01/2018 of the loan amount of Rs. 1,02,87,700/- (one crore, two lakhs, eighty seven thousand and seven hundred) obtained jointly by Pankaj Jagdish Gupta and Mrs. Ankit Pankaj Gupta in respect of flats nos. 1707, 1708 and 1709 obtained from Axis Bank vide agreement no. PHR064700411049 reveals that the said amount of loan was disbursed on 27/12/2011 and instalment thereof as paid up to 10/01/2018 are duly reflected therein.
5. The objectors thus contend that the agreements of sale (dated 01/09/2010, 27/09/2010 and 21/08/2010 pertaining to aforesaid flat nos. 1708, 1709 and 1707 respectively statedly executed by PGF in favour of PACL) as uploaded on the web portal www.auctionpacl.com pertaining to the property in favour of PACL are in consequential vis-a-vis the registered sale deeds executed by PGF in favour of objectors who are consequently in possession of the same and have been paying society maintenance charges, electricity bills etc., in respect thereof ever since.
6. The learned counsel for the objectors has argued that although the transaction in question dated 12/02/2011 has been described as "Agreement of Sale" but it is in fact a sale because clause 4 thereof confirms that part of the consideration had already been paid as per receipts mentioned therein whereas the remaining consideration was paid by the objectors after taking a home loan to the tune of Rs.1,02,87,700/- from Axis Bank which was directly disbursed by the bank to PGF Ltd. as the vendor of the said flats. I find merit in this argument because the total sale consideration fixed by agreement between the vendor and the vendee stand duly paid and accepted by them respectively and nothing else remains to be done except for getting the transaction registered with the concerned authority on payment of requisite stamp duty.
7. It is argued inter-alia that the agreement dated 12/12/2011 was executed upon receipt of no objection certificate from the society for proposed transfer of the said property by PGF Limited to the objectors. It is also pointed out that PGF Limited on its part had executed transfer forms and possession letters where upon the objectors were inducted as members of the above named co-operative society and the shares of PGF qua the said flats were transferred in favour of the objectors. It is claimed that all the original title deeds pertaining to the said flats are in the possession of the objectors herein. It may be pointed out at this stage that photostat copies of the above referred documents duly exist

ACW
26/2/18

on the file. Reference may at this stage be made to observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case bearing the title Hill Properties Ltd. Versus Union Bank of India and others reported in (2014) 1 Supreme Court Cases 635 wherein it was held that multi-storeyed flats are being purchased by people either by becoming members of cooperative housing society or shareholders of housing company and that the right of flat-owner over said flat is exclusively that of his which is transferable and heritable, though he is bound by bye-laws of society or articles of association of the company being a member of either. It was further held therein that the flat-owner can sell, donate, leave by will or let out or hypothecate his right and that such right can be taken away only by a statute.

8. It is next contended that in view of the entire sale consideration having been duly paid and objectors having been put in possession of the above described property by the vendor namely M/S PGF Limited which was previously the recorded owner thereof, the objectors herein are entitled to protect their possession on the above described flats more so when the purported agreement of sale statedly executed between PGF Ltd. and PACL is an unregistered document which did not create any better right or interest qua the property in question in favour of PACL and is thus inconsequential vis-a-vis the registered agreement of sale executed in favour of the objectors upon receipt of full sale consideration from the objectors by M/S PGF Ltd. The said argument finds support from the provisions contained in Section 53A, and 54 of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882 read with Section 17 of the Registration Act, 1908 and the observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in this context in the case bearing the title Suraj Lamp and Industries (Pvt.) Ltd. Versus State of Haryana reported in (2012) 1 SCC 656.
9. In view of the foregoing discussion, the objection petition in hand is liable to be and is hereby accepted.


Date : 26/02/2018


R. S. Virk
Distt. Judge (Retd.)

Note:

Two copies of this order are being signed simultaneously, one of which shall be retained on this file whereas the other one, also duly signed, shall be delivered to the objector as and when requested /applied for.

Date : 26/02/2018


R. S. Virk
Distt. Judge (Retd.)