

MCMOM/03/22-23

07/05/2022

**Minutes of the Managing Committee Meeting of Empire Kismet CHS Ltd.**

The Managing Committee of Empire Kismet Cooperative Housing Society Ltd. was called by the Hon. Secretary, Mr. Nanu Rohit as per notice No. Notice/03/22-23 dated 28/04/2022. The meeting was held in hybrid mode (Offline as well as Online). The offline venue was the residence of the MC Member, Mrs. Moina Baig, 23, Kismet, 48 Carter Road, Bandra West, Mumbai 400 050. The meeting was held on 07/05/2022 at 10:30 am.

The following members were present at the meeting.

Sr. No.	Name of the Member	Flat No.	Attendance Mode
1	Mr. Goenka Arun	20	Offline
2	Mr. Rohit Nanu	14	Offline
3	Mr. Janardan Mahesh	19	Offline
4	Mr. Gonsalves Godwin	2	Offline
5	Mrs. Shaikh Jamila	1	<u>Online</u>
6	Mrs. Baig Moina	23	Offline
7	Mr. Mankar Rohit	21	Offline
8	Mr. Khemani Shyam	10	<u>Online</u>

The following were special invitees to this Managing Committee Meeting on the Redevelopment process:

1. Mr. Nitin Tabhane – K.K.Ramani & Associates.
2. Mr. Ronak Mehta – Palash PMC LLP.

The meeting was chaired by Mr. Arun Goenka, the Chairman of the Society. He informed the members that originally this meeting was to be held in the Hon. Secretary's home but had to be changed. This was duly informed to all members including the special invitees. He thanked Mrs. Moina Baig for warmly welcoming everyone.

Before commencing the formal meeting, the Chairman thanked Mr. Nitin Tabhane, representing K.K.Ramani & Associates, the legal advisors of the Society for the Redevelopment Process and Mr. Ronak Mehta, Partner at Palash PMC LLP, the Project Management Consultant of the Society for taking time out of their busy schedule and being present.

Mr. Arun Goenka informed the members that since the Society was following the provisions laid down in section 79A including its revised guidelines, a copy of the above notice was uploaded to the Society's website <https://www.empirekismet.in>. He further informed the members that the Hon. Secretary had put up a copy of the said notice on the Society's notice board.

Mr. Arun Goenka informed the members that the Managing Committee had received letters from the following members and that these letters will be discussed in detail amongst other points of discussions.

1. Mr. Batliwala Sakir – Flat No. 3 / 4 / 9 & 12.
2. Mr. Batliwala Safan – Flat No. 7 & 8.
3. Mrs. Sethna Jai – Flat No. 11
4. Mr. Rohit Nanu – Flat No. 14.

With this introduction, the Chairman began with the Agenda of the Managing Committee Meeting:

**Agenda Point No. 1:**

To read and confirm minutes of the previous Managing Committee Meeting dated 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2022 and 26<sup>th</sup> April 2022.

The Chairman informed the members that the minutes of meeting of 23/04/2022 were circulated well in advance and inquired if any member had any query on the same. The members expressed their acceptance of the minutes of meeting of 23/04/2022.

The Chairman requested the Treasurer, Mr. Mahesh Janardan to read out the minutes of the meeting of 26/04/2022 for the convenience of all. Post the reading, the Chairman inquired if any member had any query or needed any change in the minutes. The members expressed their acceptance of the minutes of meeting of 26/04/2022.

**Resolution of Agenda Point No. 1:**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Managing Committee Meeting held on 23/04/2022 be accepted and confirmed.

Proposed by: Mrs. Moina Baig  
Seconded by: Mr. Godwin Gonsalves  
Passed: Unanimously.

**FURTHER RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Managing Committee Meeting held on 26/04/2022 be accepted and confirmed.

Proposed by: Mr. Rohit Mankar  
Seconded by: Mr. Arun Goenka  
Passed: Unanimously.

**Agenda Point No. 2:**

To have comprehensive discussions / deliberations on the draft tender document submitted by the Society's PMC, M/s. Palash PMC LLP. Such a discussion will cover all factors such as the suggestions / recommendations of the Society's members and the opinions of the Project Management Consultant and Legal Advisor who will also be present in this meeting.

Mr. Mehta requested permission from the Chairman to speak first since he had information that was recently obtained, which will have a bearing on most queries. The Chairman and Members agreed to this and requested Mr. Mehta to proceed with his findings and observations.

Mr. Mehta informed the members that the old approved plans and OC has been obtained from MCGM after following up multiple times. He further informed the members that he has received the files with notings. The building received the OC in 1969. He informed the members that as per the approved plans, the existing carpet area of the flats in the builder are 502 sq. ft. for 1 BHK apartments and 823 sq. ft. for 2 BHK apartments. This area has been arrived at after considering enclosure of the balconies.

The Chairman informed the members that a private survey was also done after duly informing all the members and the area indicated by Mr. Mehta is an approximate match with the measured area by the Surveyor.

Mr. Mahesh Janardan informed the members that the Society has been charging 2 BHK members at 840 sq. ft. and 1 BHK members at 505 sq. ft. Mr. Tabhane opined that since the approved plans are now available, this can be corrected in the next Managing Committee Meeting.

Both Mr. Tabhane and Mr. Mehta strongly recommended that the Society should follow the approved plan, which is on record and certified in 1969.

Members wanted to know about the status of area indicated in the agreement. Mr. Tabhane opined that there is no link between the area mentioned in the agreement and the actual area since the area mentioned in the agreement is not certified. He further opined that there will be variations in the various agreements and hence since what is known is what is certified by MCGM. He further stated that we cannot go by Individual Agreements. He finally indicated that all future agreements will have the RERA carpet area.

The Chairman asked Mr. Tabhane and Mr. Mehta whether the society should consider MOFA area or RERA area. Mr. Tabhane opined that although it is easier to measure MOFA area, RERA area should be considered. Mr. Mehta informed the members that while MOFA area is easier to measure there will be a difference in MOFA area for the same apartment if the apartment owner makes changes and hence we should always go by RERA area.

Members wanted to know if there would be any monetary or other loss by going for MOFA or RERA area. Mr. Mehta clarified that it does not change the feasibility or what the builder would provide in his offer to the members.

Mr. Tabhane suggested that both MOFA as well as RERA area be mentioned in the final tender. This was appreciated by all.

Mr. Mehta informed the members that as per the approved plan 10 parkings and 1 garage are approved. No independent garages are shown in the final plan. He further informed the members that as per the notings, MCGM had allowed the builder to construct walls up to a certain height to segregate the parkings in the stilt area. Mr. Tabhane opined that it would be prudent to mention 'Garage for parking in stilt area' in the final tender. This was appreciated by all the members.

Mr. Mehta finally informed the members that the Managing Committee has to take final decisions on the following:

- 1) Closed Tendering (Private) or by an advertisement in the news paper (Public)
- 2) The tender cost and Earnest Money Deposit (EMD)
- 3) The date of tender, tender collection period and offer submission date.
- 4) Location from where the tender is to be collected.
- 5) The carpet area.
- 6) Either additional area or hardship allowance
- 7) The percentage extra area if chosen above or the amount of hardship allowance:

The Chairman requested the members to discuss the above points in the same serial order before continuing with the agenda.

- 1) Closed Tendering (Private) or by an advertisement in the news paper (Public)

Members were unanimous that a closed tendering (Private) process be followed. This will ensure that not all and sundry tender for our project. Further the members felt that a public tender may be a reason for large and well known builders to opt out.

- 2) The tender cost and Earnest Money Deposit (EMD)

The Members requested for information regarding the tender amount. Mr. Mehta informed the members that the tender amount is anywhere between Rs. 25,000.00 to Rs. 75,000.00 depending on the location. Members felt that an amount of Rs. 50,000.00 would be fair and this was unanimously accepted.

The Members requested for information regarding the Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) amount. Mr. Mehta informed the members that this could be in the range of Rs. 5,00,000.00 to Rs. 50,00,000.00. Members felt that an amount of Rs. 25,00,000.00 would be fair and this was unanimously accepted.

- 3) The date of tender, tender collection period and offer submission date.

Mr. Mehta informed the members that he would submit the final tender during the course of the meeting. Based on this, members agreed that the tender be issued from 10/04/2022 onwards. The Chairman requested the Hon. Secretary to do the needful towards issuance of the tender. Mr. Mehta suggested that

the tender period be between 10/05/2022 and 18/05/2022 with the final date of submission being 24/05/2022. This was accepted by all the members.

4) Location from where the tender is to be collected.

The Hon. Secretary requested that the tenders be collected from the Society's office instead of his home as originally proposed. This was unanimously accepted by all the members.

5) The carpet area.

Members unanimously agreed that the area as mentioned in the approved plans be considered as suggested by both Mr. Tabhane as well as Mr. Mehta.

6) Either additional area or hardship allowance

Mrs. Shaikh wanted to know if there would be an adverse effect if a higher hardship allowance was chosen. Mr. Mehta clarified that while it is not possible to comment on what would happen in the case of a higher hardship allowance, it is logical to assume that the prospective builder would give a lower area in turn. Members felt that having a higher area is more beneficial in the long run since it would appreciate. The members unanimously agreed that the hardship allowance be kept constant and the area be fluctuating.

7) The percentage extra area if chosen above or the amount of hardship allowance:

The Hon. Secretary felt that since the building was in a prime location, builders would not only give high hardship allowance but also high area. Members appreciated this point. Mr. Tabhane suggested that a vote be carried out to determine the amount of hardship allowance. The results with amounts are as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Member	Flat No.	Amount
1	Mr. Goenka Arun	20	Rs. 7,500.00
2	Mr. Rohit Nanu	14	Rs. 10,000.00
3	Mr. Janardan Mahesh	19	Rs. 7,500.00
4	Mr. Gonsalves Godwin	2	Rs. 7,500.00
5	Mrs. Shaikh Jamila	1	Rs. 7,500.00
6	Mrs. Baig Moina	23	Rs. 7,500.00
7	Mr. Mankar Rohit	21	Rs. 7,500.00
8	Mr. Khemani Shyam	10	Rs. 7,500.00

Mr. Tabhane suggested that instead of fixing the amount as Rs. 7,500.00 the tender can reflect that the expected minimum hardship compensation is Rs. 7,500.00 / sq. ft. This was appreciated by all.

The Chairman then invited queries from the members present starting with the members participating online using the Zoom platform.

1. Mr. Khemani indicated that he had no queries and was satisfied with the process as on date.
2. Mrs. Shaikh indicated that she had no queries on agenda number 2.
3. Mrs. Baig also indicated that she had no queries on agenda number 2.
4. Mr. Gonsalves indicated that he has no queries on agenda number 2.

Mr. Mankar wanted to know if the Managing Committee has to reply to the letters issued by various members against agenda number 2. Mr. Tabhane opined that it would be better to upload the minutes of the meeting instead.

The Chairman then took up the letters received in order of receipt and requested Mr. Tabhane and Mr. Mehta to advise accordingly. Mr. Mehta indicated that he has gone through all the letters in detail and has come prepared. He requested Mr. Tabhane to join in at any stage during his replies.

**1. Letter from Mrs. Jai Sethna – Flat No. 11:**

1.1. There is no provision for the Developer to buy out a Member's current flat and the terms that comes with it. We should include that please.

Mr. Mehta clarified that the provision for compensation to the members wanting to sell their premises on an outright basis prior to approval of the plans has been covered under Sr. No. 12 of the financial bid format for builders.

1.2. The current carpet area table should not be included as we will be misleading the builder. It is clear that there are many cases where the area that is measured by the person we hired will not be the original area that the flat came with – due to walls that have been broken, common passage area that has been taken into the flat as also extensions that are not legally made. We should have the measurements of carpet areas per the original builder plan

Mr. Tabhane was very happy that this point has been raised by the member of the Society, which in his opinion was as per the prevailing law. Mr. Mehta clarified that this point was covered in the above discussions and will be incorporated in the final tender.

1.3. Is there any provision to take out insurance for the Members of the Society to safeguard against any unforeseen circumstances / issues with the redevelopment project? Please can we investigate that.

Mr. Tabhane opined that this specific issue will be investigated and requested the members to speak to their insurance advisors to see if such a product is available either to individual members or to the Society as a whole.

1.4. Overall the tender since I guess it is in draft mode – has some gaps – which when filled would be good to have a copy of the same again . Given the shortage of time as I have mentioned earlier as well – and as I am travelling – I have shared a first view of the points. I am sure there may be a few more and will share later, once we get in inputs from other experts – on the final version that you may please share with me.

Mr. Tabhane opined that the Managing Committee Meeting was called for finalization of the tender. It would not be appropriate to continuously meet and refine the tender. Mr. Mehta clarified that from a redevelopment perspective, the operative part of the tender is very important and that the Managing Committee in consultation with the PMC and Legal Advisor have arrived at all relevant information. He further clarified that each Developer will submit their detailed offer in their tender submission as per their own calculations and that it will then be up to the members of the Society to decide whether to accept or reject such a submission.

The Chairman confirmed that the final tender will be uploaded to the website of the Society for consumption of the members.

1.5. Page 9: Power of Attorney? Needs specificity with regard to scope – and what it entails very specifically

Mr. Mehta clarified that the Power of Attorney indicated in the draft tender is issued for the specific purpose of representing the Society at MCGM, Government Agencies and other statutory agencies for procuring the approvals for redevelopment. Mr. Tabhane opined that this is a standard Power of Attorney and his office will take due care of the members' concern whenever these are issued. Mr. Tabhane further opined that the members of the Society will approve the draft and it will be issued by the Managing Committee duly signed by the Chairman, Hon. Secretary and Treasurer. This along with the signatories will be approved by the Special General Body Meeting.

1.6. Page 9 Advance rent for 2 years (min) should be paid in advance to members

Mr. Mehta clarified that this has been considered under Sr. No. 8A of The Financial Bid Format for Tenderers. He further clarified that the builders will submit their offers with or without considering this

and it would up to the members of the Society to give due weightage to such submissions while selecting their preferred builder.

1.7. Page 11 45 days notice is too less. Members should be given 6 months notice to vacate and find a suitable accommodation and rent compensation should begin as soon as member finds the suitable place. Furthermore, it needs to be made clear what is the plan to manage if the works carry on beyond the 30 month time period allocated. And how members will manage rent in that period.

Mr. Mehta clarified that the period of 45 days is from the date of completion of all listed activities by the finalised Developer. The members can begin their planning well in advance. In such a case, the period of 45 days indicated is adequate. This was agreed by all.

Mr. Mehta clarified that the rental will start from the same date for all members and hence vacating within an agreeable time will ensure that there will be no major rental burden on any member. He further clarified that the tender clearly mentions that the rental from developer will continue till the repossession is provided with Full OC and not just 30 months. This is mentioned in Sr. No. 18 – Temporary Alternate Accommodation, Sr. No. 30 – Force Majeure and Sr. No. 8A of The Financial Bid Format for Tenderers.

1.8. Page 13 The sentence is technically / grammatically incorrect. It should read as follows: The allocation of flats by the Society for existing members of the Society shall be as per existing direction (sea vs garden facing) and floor rise.

Mr. Mehta clarified that this clause was approved by the Society's Legal Advisor and hence will be retained. Mr. Mahesh Janardan suggested a minor change as under:

Allotment of Flats and parking to the existing members will be done by the Society. The allocation of the flats by the Society for existing members of the Society shall be as per the direction and floor rise of the existing flats of the members subject to planning possibilities.

This was accepted by all and Mr. Mehta indicated that the same will be incorporated in the final tender.

1.9. Page 15 The current building does not have any stilt parking. All garages are closed garages right from the inception of the Society. We should not entertain any discussions on stilt parking. Garage owners can demand the following (these options should be up-front put into the tender): a) Additional parking space over and above what has been allocated to each member b) Suitable monetary compensation c) Adjustment in flat area

Mr. Mehta clarified this point has been covered. Based on the approved drawings obtained from MCGM and as discussed above, it has been decided to mention 'Garage for parking in stilt area' in the final tender.

1.10. List of builders.

The list of builders provided by the member was taken on record.

## **2. Letter from Mr. Sakir Batliwala & Mr. Safan Batliwala - Flat No. 3/4/9 & 12 and 7 & 8:**

As was done in the last Managing Committee Meeting, Mr. Mehta took permission to club both letters together since they were identical in all respects in terms of the points raised. Mr. Tabhane felt this was appropriate.

2.1. The learned PMC has Omitted Storeroom belonging to me which was purchased by us and acknowledged by the Society on various occasion at several times. The PMC should safe guard the interest and benefits of the members in all aspects. The Society has appointed PMC on our behalf i.e. Members and for the benefit of the members.

Mr. Tabhane opined that the Managing Committee is duty bound to follow the approved drawing, which does not show the storeroom indicated by the member. Mr. Mehta suggested that this matter can be taken up with the finalized builder at a later stage. This was accepted by all.

2.2. For the Sake of Transparency all Correspondence namely issue of Tenders Collection of Tenders etc. should be from Society's Office and not from the Residence of any member or Office Bearer's Residency or any other place and available for perusal for all members.

Mr. Tabhane opined that the Managing Committee should consider this point raised. The Hon. Secretary informed Mr. Tabhane and the members that due to the poor state of the Society's office, he had volunteered to use his home and would not like anyone to cast aspersions on this gesture. Members voiced their support for the Hon. Secretary. It was decided that the tender collection be done from the Society's office. The Chairman clarified that all other correspondence comes in the name of Chairman / Hon. Secretary and is collected by the Society's security personnel or the Society's assistant.

2.3. The proposed EMD amount or Percentage is not mentioned in the draft for the best reasons known to yourselves.

Mr. Mehta clarified that the member was commenting on the draft tender where the EMD amount or percentage area cannot be indicated till such time that the Managing Committee finalises it. The figures have been finalised above and shall be part of the final tender.

2.4. Para 11 Item (b) of the Draft Tender It should be mentioned as entire FSI (including Fungible)/ TDR

Mr. Mehta clarified that entire FSI as indicated in Sr. No. 11 (b) of the draft tender includes the fungible FSI.

2.5. It is mention as requisite Submission of Bank Guarantee / Lien is mentioned in the Para 11, item (f) but the amount Time Limit of Bank Guarantee is not mentioned in the same, we should have our own bench mark as minimum amount and time for the safety of the members.

Mr. Mehta clarified that Bank guarantee indicated in Sr. No. 11 (f) is applicable after selection and completing final negotiations with the builder. This can be taken at the appropriate time with advice from the Society's advocate. Mr. Tabhane concurred with this.

2.6. Para 14 item (2), Minimum period to vacate the premises should be at least 3 Months so as to enable the members who have given the premises on leave and license to One months notice to vacate the premises by the Licensee and at least 45 days for removal of furniture and fixtures etc.

Mr. Mehta clarified that this point has been covered in Sr. No. 1.7 above. The Chairman added that the process of redevelopment is ongoing and members will have adequate time to prepare after finalizing the Builder. The time mentioned is after the builder completes all formalities as put out by the Society's PMC.

2.7. Para 19 Details of the New Building a minimum List of Amenities Such as Swimming Pool, Gymnasium etc is not mentioned raising doubts of unequal opportunity to bidders.

Mr. Mehta clarified that the tender asks for the amenities to be proposed by the Builder. This puts pressure on the builder to ensure that he covers all requisite amenities rather than a prepared list. The members of the Society can use the information received from various builders and then compile a final list before final negotiations with the builder.

2.8. Para 20 The Bidder should not be entitled to create any mortgage, lien encumber etc. on his sale entitlement area save and except registered sale or allotment of the of the sale entitlement area.

Mr. Tabhane opined that the development agreement will not allow the Developer to create a lien on anything owned by the Society but the builder will be allowed to mortgage the free sale flats.

2.9. Para 22 Timelines for the Project, timeline chart should be strictly followed and the period should be strictly specified the Society and its Members cannot wait for infinite period at 18% Interest per annum.

Mr. Tabhane opined that this point will be covered in the development agreement.

2.10. The Payment of Rentals for the vacating members will be paid until OC is received and not only for 30 months.

Mr. Mehta clarified that this point has been covered in Sr. No. 1.7 above.

2.11. Page 18 Information of the Society a Storeroom adjoining Garage No. 11 of the Society is not mentioned

Mr. Mehta clarified that this point is repetitive and has been covered in Sr. No. 2.1 above.

2.12. Page 23, Item No.9, We should not restrict ourselves to Hardship Compensation of Rs 7500/-, I fail to understand the idea behind it we can always mention not below or minimum amount of Rs 7,500/-. As we are in Prime Location a Hardship Compensation of Rs 10,000/- can be achieved for the benefit off all the members.

Mr. Mehta clarified that this has been covered in Sr. No. 7 above.

2.13. It has come to our knowledge through our business associates that our Proposed Redevelopment Project is already in the market through Brokers with various Builders / Redevelopers. The Office Bearer and Managing committee members should take a strong note of the same as this can be a loss to the Society and its Members not only monetarily but in various ways. If any Brokerage fees is payable it should come to the coffers of the society for the benefit of the society and its members.

The Chairman clarified that the Managing Committee will be strictly following the tender and will not accept any such conditions either from members or from the builders. All the Managing Committee Members voiced their strong support for this.

2.14. We request the Office Bearer, Managing Committee members to kindly put up the suggestions/ objections by any member/s to be put up on web site or notice board of the society for the benefit of all the members and giving transparency to the project rather than keeping it for the managing committee itself.

The Chairman stated that this point raised by the member is without merit. He clarified that all information regarding the redevelopment has always been shared with all members and the minutes of meeting has been uploaded to the website of the Society. The minutes of the meeting outline all the points raised and the clarifications given by the either the Society's Advocate or PMC or by the Office Bearers. The Managing Committee Members voiced their strong support not only to the Chairman but also to the Office Bearers.

2.15. We request the office bearers that since this is just a Draft Tender, a Final Tender with all the details/ suggestions / omissions included completed in all respects should be circulated for the approval of the members

Mr. Tabhane clarified that this has been covered in Sr. No. 1.4 above.

2.16. List of builders.

The list of builders provided by the member was taken on record.

### **3. Letter from Mr. Nanu Rohit - Flat No. 14:**

3.1. Please note sr no 3 C page no 22 it's mentioned only 8 Stilt parkings as we discussed last meeting please kindly revise to all Garages

Mr. Mehta indicated that this point has been clarified above and Mr. Tabhane has opined that it would be prudent to mention 'Garage for parking in stilt area' in the final tender.

3.2. For the Hardship compensation the amount mentioned is Rs. 7500 /sqft on page no23 Sr. No. 9 I would suggest as we discussed in our last meeting please revise to Rs. 10,000 per sq/ft

Mr. Mehta clarified that this has been covered in Sr. No. 7 above.

### 3.3. List of builders.

The list of builders provided by the member was taken on record.

The Chairman took on record the names of builders provided by all the members. He requested Mr. Mahesh Janardan to circulate the same on the WhatsApp group created for the redevelopment process.

Mr. Tabhane informed all the members that in the case of redevelopment, members should read and review all the minutes of meeting prepared as on date since many points raised by members have been covered in the previous Managing Committee Meeting dated 26/04/2022, which was passed in this meeting.

As previously informed in the Managing Committee Meeting dated 26/04/2022, the Chairman informed the members that ample opportunity will be given to all members to discuss once the Developers are shortlisted.

Mr. Mehta submitted the final tender covering the points above for the review and approval of the Managing Committee Members. The members thanked him for the quick preparation and submission. All the points discussed were checked.

The Chairman once again checked with all the members whether they had any other questions. He thanked all the members for the comprehensive discussions running into more than three hours and hoped the queries of members have been answered and all doubts cleared. Mr. Arun Goenka then requested members to approve the agenda point no. 2.

### **Resolution of Agenda Point No. 2:**

1. **RESOLVED** that the Managing Committee proceed with a closed tendering (Private) process and request members to contact their suggested builders to collect the tender documents from the Society's office. The number of the Chairman and Hon. Secretary be mentioned in the tender notice so that prospective builders can call and collect the tender documents.
2. **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the tender amount be fixed at Rs. 50,000.00, which will be non refundable. The Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) be fixed at Rs. 25,00,000.00, which will be refundable except to the successful bidder.
3. **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the tender collection date be finalised between 10/05/2022 to 18/05/2022 and the final date of submission be 24/05/2022.
4. **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the tender collection be from the Society's office between 10:00 am to 05:00 pm.
5. **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the tender reflect the carpet area as per approved MCGM plans. Both MOFA as well as RERA areas be indicated.
6. **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the hardship allowance be fixed and the area fluctuating.
7. **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the hardship allowance be fixed at a minimum of Rs. 7,500.00 per sq. ft.
8. **FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Tender submitted by the Society's PMC with corrections as per discussions be accepted for issuance.

Proposed By: Mr. Rohit Mankar

Seconded By: Mrs. Jamila Shaikh

Passed: Unanimously except for Sr. No. 7, this was passed by majority of seven for and one against.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Tabhane and Mr. Mehta for sparing their valuable time and answering all the questions raised. The Chairman once again thanked Mrs. Moina Baig for the wonderful hospitality and for allowing her home to be used as the venue for this important Managing Committee Meeting.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

for **EMPIRE KISMET COOPERATIVE HOUSING SOCIETY LTD.**

(Regd.No.Bom/Hsg/2151 of 1969, Dated 19/08/1969)



**MR. ARUN GOENKA**  
**(CHAIRMAN)**



**MR. NANU ROHIT**  
**(HON. SECRETARY)**

Place: Mumbai

Date: 07/05/2022