

PRESIDENT  
Dharmesh Jain

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT  
Vimal Shah

PRESIDENT-ELECT  
Mayur Shah

VICE PRESIDENTS  
Nayan Shah  
Deepak Goradia  
Boman R. Irani  
Harish Patel

HON. SECRETARY  
Nainesh Shah

HON. TREASURER  
Sukhraj Nahar

CEO  
S. Shahzad Hussain  
I.A.S. (Retd.)

SPECIAL PROJECTS  
Bandish Ajmera  
Rasesh Kanakia  
Parag Munot

HON. JOINT SECRETARIES  
Ashok Mohanani  
Sandeep Runwal  
Lakshman Bhagtani

JOINT TREASURER  
Mukesh Patel

CO-ORDINATORS  
Jagdish Ahuja  
Pujit Aggarwal  
Domnic Romell

COMMITTEE MEMBERS  
Jayesh Shah  
Nayan Bheda  
Sanjay Chhabria  
Shailesh Sanghvi  
Tejas Vyas  
Jitendra Jain

INVITEE MEMBERS  
Sandeep Raheja  
Munish Doshi  
Navin Makhija  
Rushank Shah  
Deepak Gundecha  
Pratik Patel  
Rajeev Jain  
Diipesh Bhagtani  
Dhaval Ajmera  
Shyamal Mody  
Nikunj Sanghavi  
Digant Parekh

PAST PRESIDENT  
Paras Gundecha  
Sunil Mantri  
Pravin Doshi  
Mohan Deshmukh  
Mofatraj Munot  
Niranjan Hiranandani  
Rajni S. Ajmera  
Late G. L. Raheja  
Late Lalit Gandhi  
Late Babubhai Majethia

MCHI-CREDAI UNITS  
President, Thane  
Suraj Parmar  
President, Kalyan-Dombivli  
Praful Shah  
President, Mira Virar City  
Ashit Shah  
President, Raigad  
Vikas Bhamre  
President, Navi Mumbai  
Arvind Goel

Ref. No. MCHI/PRES/15-16/017

July 29, 2015

To,  
Hon'ble Shri Prakash Mehta  
Minister for Housing Department  
Government of Maharashtra  
Mantralaya,  
Mumbai - 400 032.

*लिपिक 30/07/15*  
मंत्रि, ग. निर्माण, कामगार व खनिकर्म  
यांचे कार्यालय, मंत्रालय, मुंबई 400 032

Sub: Provisions of MOFA - Section 7 and 7A.

Respected Sir,

This is to bring to your notice certain recent Judgments interpreting the provisions of Section 7 and 7A of Maharashtra Ownership Flats (Regulation of the Promotion of Construction, Sale, Management and Transfer) Act, 1963 ("MOFA").

1. The Bombay High Court in the matter of Kalpita Enclave Co-operative Housing Society Ltd. v/s. M/s. Kiran Builders Pvt. Ltd., (1985) 88 BLR 100, interpreted Section 7(1) (ii), observing that contraventions contemplated in the said Section are not confined to the construction of buildings only; this contravention may extend to the construction of any additional structure not in the original plans and specifications as approved by the local authority. Thus, if the original plans and specifications on the basis of which the persons were persuaded to purchase the flats disclosed that certain areas will be kept open, it would be a clear contravention of the agreements as well as of law if the promoter proceeds to construct additional structures on those open spaces, even with the sanction of the Municipal Corporation.
2. The Bombay High Court further held that a Promoter was not entitled to put up additional structures not shown in the original layout plan without the consent of the flat takers. Thus, consent was attached to the concept of additional structures.
3. Section 7 was therefore amended and Section 7A was inserted in order to make the position explicit, which according to the Legislature existed prior to 1986, implicitly. Further, it was declared vide Section 7A that the expression contained in Section 7(1)(ii) as it existed before commencement of the Amendment Act, viz. "(ii) any other alterations or additions in the structure of the building without the previous consent of all the persons who have agreed to take the flats in such building", shall be deemed never to apply in respect of any other

**MCHI-CREDAI**

Maker Bhavan II, 4th Floor, 18, V. Thackersey Marg, New Marine Lines, Mumbai - 400 020.  
Tel.: 4212 1421, Fax : 4212 1411 / 407 • Email: secretariat@mchi.net • Website : www.mchi.net

additional building constructed or to be constructed under a scheme or project of development in the layout, notwithstanding anything contained in the MOFA or in any agreement or in any judgment, decree or order of the court. Consequently, reading Section 7 and 7A, it is clear that the question of taking prior consent of the flat takers does not arise after amendment in respect of any construction of additional structures.

4. This intention of the Legislature is evident from the Statement of Objects and Reasons for introducing Section 7A. The relevant portion thereof is reproduced hereunder -

*“The prohibition of making additions and alterations under this provision is in relation to a building wherein the purchasers of the flats have taken or to take flats. It was never intended that this provision should operate even in respect of construction of additional buildings according to a scheme or project of development of total layout. In Kalpita Enclave Co-operative Housing Society Ltd. v/s. Kiran Builders Private Ltd. (1986 Mh. L.J. 110) the High Court of Bombay has held that the contravention contemplated in section 7(1) or in section 7(2) which includes alterations in the structures or construction of additional structures, is not confined to the construction of the buildings only; and this contravention may extend to the construction of any additional structure not in the original plans and specifications as approved by the local authority. Such an interpretation of these provisions would result into the flat purchasers in one building objecting to the additions and alterations being made in any other buildings although such alterations and additions are consented to by the persons who have taken or who are to take flats in such other buildings or even if they are permissible under the building rules or building bye-laws or development control rules and are approved by the local authority. This would further result into retarding the growth of construction of buildings and increasing the housing stock. If the total layout permits construction of more buildings in accordance with the building rules or building bye-laws or the development control rules made under any law for the time being in force, there should be no impediment in construction of the additional buildings.”*

5. However inspite of the above, the provisions of Section 7A and the clear mandate and intent of the Legislature, the Courts have, in certain Judgments, held that in view of non disclosures as per Section 3 and 4 of the MOFA and Clauses 3 and 4 of the Format of Agreement given under the MOFA, the Developer cannot construct additional buildings, if such building/s is/are not shown in the layout plan disclosed to the flat purchasers at the time of entering into agreement for sale. The provisions contained in these Sections and Clauses relate only to additions and alterations in the flat and/or in the building itself and not to additional structures being constructed as per the plans duly

sanctioned by the local authority. The same has rendered the provisions of Section 7A infructuous and consequently the further development cannot take place in the large layout which are being developed in a phased manner. Much of the potential of the land will remain unexploited.

6. Such interpretation by the court, is not only contrary to the provisions of Section 7A, the same is also not consistent with Housing Policy of the State Government. The State Government in view of shortage of housing in the State of Maharashtra, has always encouraged optimal exploitation of the land and construction of more and more housing so that the housing is provided to the maximum people. In view of such interpretation, the maximum exploitation of land for providing more and more housing cannot take place.
7. Some of the Judgments where such retrospective interpretation of Section 7 and Section 7A have been given are as under –
  - (i) Madhuvihar Co-op. Hsg. Society v/s. Jayantilal Investments  
2010(6) Bom.C.R. 517
  - (ii) Asian Development Corporation & Ors. v/s. Kavita Co-op. Housing Society Ltd. & Ors.  
2012(1) Bom.C.R. 666
  - (iii) White Towers Co-op. Hsg. Society Ltd. v/s. S.K. Builders & Ors.  
2008(6) Bom.C.R.371
  - (iv) Malad Kokil Co-op. Hsg. Society Ltd. & Anr. v/s. Modern Construction Co. Ltd. & Ors.  
2013(2) Bom.C.R. 414
  - (v) Zircon Venture Co-op. Hsg. Society Ltd. v/s. Zircon Ventures & Ors.  
2014(5) Bom.C.R. 158
  - (vi) Eternia Co-op. Hsg. Society Ltd. & Ors. v/s. Lake View Developers & Ors.  
Notice of Motion No. 62 of 2014 in Suit No. 54 of 2014
  - (vii) Lake View Developers & Ors. v/s. Eternia Co-op. Hsg. Society Ltd. & Ors.  
Appeal (L) No. 189 of 2015 in Notice of Motion No. 62 of 2014 in Suit No. 54 of 2014

8. We therefore urged the Government to introduce necessary retrospective amendment to Section 7A by introducing a new Section, as Section 7B to overcome this debacle to the effect that in case of layout development, a Promoter / Developer shall always be entitled to construct additional building/ structure, even if the same has not been disclosed in the layout plans, shown to the flat purchasers of the earlier buildings in the layout and that the consent of the flat purchasers is not required to be taken for such additional building/ structures.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,  
For MCHI-CREDAI



**Dharmesh Jain**  
President