

**POONAM PROPERTY CO-OPERATIVE  
HOUSING SOCIETY LIMITED**

**(Reg. No. BOM/HSC/3780/OF 26<sup>th</sup> SEP 1972)**

**Minutes of the Special General Meeting  
Held on 11 May 2025**

**Registered Office**

**B – 2 Poonam Apartments**

**Dr. Annie Besant Road**

**Shiv Sagar Estate**

**Worli, Mumbai – 400 018.**

**Mobile: 7021863066**

**Email: [poonam.apartments@gmail.com](mailto:poonam.apartments@gmail.com)**

**Website: <https://poonamapartments.com>**



### MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING HELD ON 11 MAY 2025

Due to the lack of quorum, Hon. Chairman adjourned the Special General Meeting by half an hour and reconvened it at 10:30 a.m.

At 10:30 a.m., Hon. Chairman resumed the adjourned meeting and requested all members to stand and observe a one-minute silence in memory of the Indian's who lost their lives recently.

After the house observed a minute of silence the Hon. Chairman welcomed all the members to the Special General Meeting and informed them that leave of absence had been received from the following managing committee members:

- Mr. Pankaj Shah, Vice-Chairman
- Mr. Ajoy D'Souza, Committee Member
- Mrs. Amita Shah, Committee Member

He further informed the members that the following requests had been received from primary members authorizing other members to attend the meeting on their behalf, valid up to 08 May 2025:

Flat No.	Name of Member	Proxy Attendee	Relationship
B 105	Mrs. D. L. Tolat	Mr. L. C. Tolat	Associate Member
B 604	Mrs. Sangeeta Debrai	Mr. Rohit Debrai	Associate Member
A 601	Mrs. Urmila Babulal Bhandari	Mr. Rajiv Babulal Bhandari	Joint Member
C 507	Mrs. Pinky Ranka	Mr. Sanjay Ranka	Associate Member
B 101	Mrs. Kokilaben Mahesh Shah	Mr. Hitesh Mahesh Shah	Joint Member
A 406	Mrs. Manju Aggarwal	Mr. Ashish Aggarwal	Associate Member

Additionally, a request was received from Mr. Ashwin A. Shah (B 507) for Mr. Rupesh Ashwin Shah to attend the meeting on his behalf. However, it was noted that Mr. Rupesh Ashwin Shah is not a registered member and is therefore not eligible to vote.

A request was also received from Mrs. Sangeeta Jayantkumar Sancheti (B 508) for her daughter, Miss Shefali Jayantkumar Sancheti, to attend the meeting on her behalf. Hon. Chairman informed the members accordingly, and the house unanimously approved the request.

Following this, the Hon. Chairman read out the agenda for the meeting:



## **Agenda**

To approve and appoint a legal firm to handle the proposed redevelopment of the Society, to approve the legal fees as per the quotation provided, and to decide the instalment amount to be collected from Society members. (Refer Annexure – A: Explanatory Note)

Hon. Chairman stated that the explanatory note was attached to the meeting notice and would be considered as read. He then handed over the proceedings to the Hon. Secretary, Mr. Kamlesh Jain.

Hon. Secretary informed the members that this agenda item was being overseen by the Hon. Joint Secretary, Mr. Aman Khan, and invited him to take the discussion forward. Hon. Joint Secretary addressed the house by reading out his written remarks on this.

The Special General Meeting (SGM) held on 2nd June 2024, where the Managing Committee (MC) sought approval from the house to onboard a legal firm for the Society's redevelopment, it was evident that members strongly emphasized the importance of selecting the most capable legal partner. The general consensus was that this is one of the most critical initial steps in the redevelopment process, as a competent legal firm would be required to support the Society through multiple legal stages, including developer selection and final possession.

Members clearly stated that the selection should not be based solely on the lowest bid (L1). Several well-known firms were recommended both during and after the meeting.

Taking into account these member suggestions, input from the Redevelopment Committee (RDC), and the MC's own research, outreach was made to 14 top-tier and mid-range legal firms, listed as follows:

1. MDP & Partners
2. Khaitan & Company
3. ANB Legal
4. L. D. Shah & Company
5. Desai Desai Carrimjee & Mulla (DDCM)
6. Economic Laws Practice (ELP)
7. ASA Legal
8. Mulla and Mulla & Craigie Blunt & Caroe
9. Kanga and Company
10. Wadia Ghandy & Company
11. Shah & Sanghvi Attorneys
12. M/s. Vimadalal & Company
13. M/s. Markand Gandhi & Co.
14. Abhishek Sharma





Over a period of time, members from the M.C. and RDC met with representatives of these firms in one-on-one meetings. During these interactions, the firms were briefed on the Society's current status, and their responses were evaluated based on their level of interest, responsiveness, accessibility, and their proposed approach to our redevelopment.

Based on these assessments, the MC and RDC shortlisted the following seven firms and sent them a standardized scope of work, requesting sealed quotations:

1. MDP & Partners
2. ANB Legal
3. L. D. Shah & Company
4. Desai Desai Carrimjee & Mulla (DDCM)
5. Economic Laws Practice (ELP)
6. Wadia Ghandy & Company
7. Abhishek Sharma

Once all sealed quotations were received, they were opened in a transparent forum. After careful review, the MC and RDC jointly recommended **Economic Laws Practice (ELP)** as the most suitable legal partner. ELP brings with it an excellent reputation and demonstrated expertise in real estate and redevelopment matters, making it a strong and reliable choice for Poonam Society.

An additional advantage was the recent inclusion of Mr. Sudip Mullick into ELP's team. Mr. Mullick is a distinguished legal professional with over 30 years of experience in real estate, construction, and hospitality law, previously associated with Khaitan & Co.

Subsequent negotiations with ELP led to a reduction in their proposed fee structure, which now falls well within the financial limits initially approved by the house. The fee will be paid in instalments, and the MC and RDC will work out a suitable payment schedule.

It is also worth noting that every top Project Management Consultant (PMC) we consulted strongly advised onboarding a **single legal firm** to manage and consolidate all legal aspects related to the redevelopment.

To conclude, there are several ongoing legal issues including pending documents at the Custom House, potential stamp duty liabilities, consent terms with our neighbor, lease-related concerns, the unpossessed 16%, and rent-related matters. These are all interconnected with the redevelopment process and require legal clarity and coordination.

Having a single, competent legal firm managing all of this will provide the Society with unified, strategic legal advice and ensure that our interests are protected at every stage.



While the house had already granted permission to appoint a legal firm within the approved budget, the MC and RDC felt it was important to transparently present the entire process and final recommendation to the members.

Hon. Secretary, Mr. Kamlesh Jain, asked Mr. Tolat whether he would prefer that the letter submitted by him be read aloud or if he would like to address the house directly. Mr. Tolat opted to speak.

Mr. L.C. Tolat (B -105) began by acknowledging the briefing provided by the Hon. Joint Secretary regarding the day's proceedings. However, he expressed concern that the general body of members is not being adequately informed about the activities and discussions taking place within the Managing Committee (MC) and the Redevelopment Committee (RDC). He stressed the importance of transparency and regular communication with members regarding decisions and developments in these meetings.

He further pointed out that it is a statutory requirement to keep members informed particularly in matters such as negotiations with legal firms and associated fee structures well in advance of meetings, so members can make informed decisions.

Mr. L.C. Tolat (B – 105) noted that members should be given an opportunity to review and consider such matters ahead of time. Drawing on his experience of over 50 years in the field, he shared that when he requested access to relevant information, he was instructed to visit the office, review the files, mark the required documents, and only then would copies be provided subject to payment of applicable charges.

He emphasized that such a process is not conducive to open access and transparency and called for a more member-friendly approach in sharing important information.

Mr. Prashant Das (A-602) interrupted to state that, as a member of the Redevelopment Committee (RDC), he should have himself kept abreast about the discussions.

Mr. L.C. Tolat (B - 105) responded, explaining that due to health issues, he has been unable to regularly attend meetings and has been in and out of the hospital. He shared that his information has primarily come from the WhatsApp group and reiterated that he is not contesting what the Hon. Joint Secretary shared. He stated that he supports redevelopment but emphasized the need for transparency, in line with the statutory guidelines of 79A and the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act. He insisted that all relevant information should be shared with members through the Society's website, not just with MC and RDC.

Mr. Tolat proposed postponing the current SGM, uploading all documents online for members to review and understand, and then reconvening to take informed decisions. He clarified that he is not seeking to stall progress but is merely expressing his views. Ultimately, it is for the majority to decide whether to proceed despite any non-compliance.





He reminded the members that once the premises are handed over, the responsibility and any consequences lie with them.

Mr. Dhiren Karani (A - 804) commented that ongoing delays are hampering the redevelopment process, ultimately leading to losses for members.

Mr. Nimish Kothari (Committee Member) explained that while documents were meant to be uploaded, technical issues with the website prevented this. However, all required documents have been available online for the past six months.

Hon. Joint Secretary clarified that a uniform scope of work was shared with all legal firms to ensure a fair "apple-to-apple" comparison. All firms submitted sealed quotes based on this scope, which were opened in the presence of MC and RDC members. He emphasized that the process was fair and questioned what fault could be found in this approach.

Mr. Gautam Vora (D - 001) acknowledged the efforts taken but pointed out that members were not informed about the exact scope of work shared with legal firms or their responses.

Mrs. Rita Billimoria (B - 202) added that no one is questioning the MC's intent, but the lack of communication about the scope of work is concerning.

Mr. Sanjoy Das (B - 702) highlighted that during the SGM held in May last year, a budget of ₹50 lakhs for legal expenses was proposed and objected to. In his letter to the MC, he had asked for the scope of work, quotes received, and an evaluation matrix detailing the strengths and weaknesses of each firm. He stressed that these decisions impact the Society for the next 10 years, and full transparency is essential. He also pointed out that he had requested the RDC meeting minutes but never received them. He concluded by saying that the members lack the information necessary to make an informed decision and feel like "blind children," completely in the dark.

Dr. Pramod Shah (B - 003) remarked that members need clarity on longstanding legal issues such as the conveyance deed, ownership title, and ongoing disputes with the Dhanwatey group. Without understanding these, it's premature to discuss legal representation for redevelopment.

Mr. B. Mallik (B - 602) reminded the house that the Committee had promised quarterly updates at the last SGM. Instead of asking members to visit the office, documents should be uploaded online. He compared it to a doctor's clinic where charges are transparent. He asked for clarity on whether any of the ₹50 lakh has been spent and urged for a system of regular disclosure. He asked why the proposals can't be shared and noted that secrecy only breeds suspicion. He also clarified that members are willing to pay for document copies, but access must be straightforward.



Mrs. Rita Billimoria (B - 202) again stressed that uploading documents online would resolve most concerns.

Mr. Dhiren Karani (A - 804) asked whether members present had attended the SGM where the ₹50 lakh budget was approved, reiterating that the house had already resolved this matter and questioning the need to revisit it.

Hon. Secretary, responded by highlighting that the current meeting itself was a mark of transparency, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> of June 2024, SGM, the ₹50 lakh allocation had been approved with a promise to return for final confirmation before expenditure. If the intent was not to be transparent, the MC could have just issued a circular announcing the selected legal firm. The SGM notice had been issued 20 days prior and circulated via WhatsApp groups and email, with an open invitation to visit the Society office for any clarifications. Mr. Jain noted that not all details were uploaded online to maintain confidentiality. He expressed concern that members were contacting law firms directly, creating unnecessary complications.

He also addressed Mr. Tolat, stating that as a respected RDC member, he could have raised his concerns during committee meetings. The scope of work had been available in the Society office since the SGM notice went out, so questions about it now are misplaced. He added that majority decisions must be respected even if a few members propose alternate routes. He criticized the practice of sending objection letters after such meetings simply because one's own suggestions weren't accepted.

Hon. Joint Secretary asked Mr. Sanjoy Das whether he had reviewed the legal firm file, which had been available in the Society office for 25 days. Mr. Das replied that he received the SGM notice only on 6 May 2025. However, Mr. Jain and other MC members countered that the notice was circulated earlier via WhatsApp groups and individual emails and therefore he cannot say that he did not know about the SGM.

Hon. Secretary then asked the members if they approved appointing Economic Laws Practice (ELP) as the legal firm for the redevelopment.

Mr. Mallik clarified that while approval may be granted, it does not absolve the MC or RDC from sharing documents upon request. He asked whether copies of documents would be provided for a fee, and the MC answer was yes.

Hon. Joint Secretary then read out the complete Scope of Work that had been shared with the legal firms for quotation.





## **DETAILED SCOPE OF LEGAL SERVICES FOR REDEVELOPMENT**

### **1. Title Due Diligence and Advice**

- a. Reviewing the chain of title documents pursuant to which the Society had acquired the land.
- b. Reviewing the lease deed and other documents executed by the Society with the holder of neighbouring plot in relation to Madhuli/Crest hotels (neighbouring society) Land and agreement/documents executed in relation to the ROW Land, to be provided by the Client.
- c. Reviewing the papers and proceeding relating to pending litigation between the Society and neighbouring plot holder (Madhuli CHS/Crest Hotels Limited) for identifying the issues and understanding the possible implication of the same on the Societies ability to undertake redevelopment of the said Property and discussing the possible way forward on such litigation.
- d. Perusing the approved plans, occupation certificate, property register cards, development plan remarks, set-back area details, bye-laws of the Society, details / description of all the flats/units, list of members and areas occupied by them
- e. Reviewing the latest and old revenue records that would be provided by the Client or may be extracted from the concerned authority in respect of the property.
- f. Seeking clarifications from Society as may be required after review of the documents and raising requisitions on the Society in relation to the title.
- g. Conducting searches through a search clerk in the records of the jurisdictional Sub-Registrar of Assurances for identifying the registered transactions in respect of the said Land from the date of 1<sup>st</sup> acquisition (30 years at least).
- h. Inspecting original title documents in relation to the land; and
- i. Basis the above steps, identifying the potential title issues and actions / steps as may be required to be taken by the Society for resolving such issues and the disclosures which may be required to be made to the potential developer in the tender documents to be circulated for redevelopment of the said Property.

### **2. Updating Property Card**

- a. Assisting for updating the property register card/s
- b. Understanding the issues relating to the garden, swimming pool, parking etc. and advising in respect thereof





### 3. Acquisition of Revisionary Rights of Leasehold Plot

- a. Advising on proposed acquisition of reversionary right of the portion of the land which is held by the Society on lease basis; and
- b. Drafting, revising and finalizing the agreements to be executed between the Society and the Lessor for acquisition of reversionary right of the Leasehold Land which is held by the Society on lease basis and assisting for the registration of the same.
  - i. Memorandum of Understanding.
  - ii. Deed of Conveyance.
  - iii. Power of Attorney.
  - iv. Any other ancillary document.

### 4. Till execution of Development Agreement

- a. Holding meetings and discussions with the Society.
- b. Advising, vetting, recommending revisions in draft resolutions to be passed at the Special General Body Meeting in respect of the redevelopment of the captioned Property and providing comments on the same.
- c. Drafting / vetting the notices for general body resolution and minutes of such meetings to be held in relation to the redevelopment of the said Property.
- d. Drafting the public notice calling for bids in respect of redevelopment of the said Property.
- e. Drafting bid / tender documents, in the event bids are to be called regarding the proposed redevelopment.
- f. Issuing public notices calling for bids for redevelopment.
- g. Evaluating and reviewing the bids that may be submitted by prospective developers.
- h. Attending Special General Meetings of the members of the society/Society for explaining and discussing the drafts of the Development Agreement, Power of Attorney, Permanent Alternate Accommodation Agreement and addressing queries raised during such meeting.
- i. Advising Society with regards to implication of Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016.
- j. Holding meetings and discussions with the proposed developer(s) for finalizing the terms of proposed redevelopment of Property.
- k. Advising the Society on the procedure to be followed by the Society under Section 79A of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960 in connecting with the redevelopment of its property. Please note that scope would not



include advising on any technical aspects / DCR provisions which are within the domain of an Architect / PMC.

- l. Attending meetings to be held for selection of the Developer, if required by the Society.
- m. Drafting, reviewing, revising, negotiating and finalization of the Letter of Intent/Memorandum of Understanding to be executed between the Society and the Developer.
- n. Advising, vetting, reviewing, revising, negotiating and finalization of the Development Agreement to be executed by the Society with the Developer, the draft of which shall be prepared and shared by the Developer.
- o. Advising, vetting, reviewing, revising, negotiating and finalization of the Power of Attorney(s) to be executed by the Society in favour of the Developer, the draft of which shall be prepared and shared by the Developer.
- p. Drafting, reviewing, revising, negotiating and finalization of the format/template Consent Letter / Irrevocable Consent of the Members.
- q. Advising, vetting, reviewing, revising, negotiating and providing comments on the Bank Guarantee/Corporate Guarantee etc. to be provided by the Developer.
- r. Attending meetings with the Committee Members, prospective Developer, Developer's representatives/legal counsel, for negotiating and finalizing all documents related to redevelopment process, to protect the interests of society and its members.
- s. Attending meetings, conferences and teleconferences with the managing committee of Society for discussing the drafts of the Development Agreement, Power of Attorney

#### **5. From Execution of Development Agreement till Execution of PAAA**

- a. Advising, vetting, reviewing, revising, negotiating and finalization of the format/template of the following documents the draft of which shall be prepared and shared by the Developer:
  - i. Individual Agreement/Permanent Alternate Accommodation Agreement in respect of the Member's New Premises.
  - ii. Payment receipts of monthly displacement compensation, hardship fund compensation, brokerage charges, shifting charges, letter of obtaining possession of respective flats for demolition, letter for obtaining possession of society.





- b. Attending meetings, conferences and teleconferences with the managing committee of Society for discussing the drafts of Permanent Alternate Accommodation Agreement.

#### **6. At the time of Possession of the Flats to the Society**

Vetting, negotiating and revising the forms/template drafts of the following documents to be prepared and shared by the Developer at the time of handover of possession of the flats and the car parks post completion of the construction of the project.

- a. Possession letter
- b. Car parking allotment letter.
- c. Undertaking for usage of car parking, undertaking for no addition and alteration; and
- d. Any other incidental documents to be executed at the time of possession.

After reading out the scope of work, Mr. Khan stated that if anyone had reviewed the file, they would have seen that a comparative table had been prepared, showing the charges quoted by each law firm under each specific category.

Mr. L. C. Tolat (B - 105) clarified that he is not disputing any point raised and intends to go through all the details thoroughly. If necessary, he reserves the right to discuss the matter further.

He focused on one specific issue concerning the execution of registered documents for acquiring the rights of the lessor. He explained that more than 64 lessors had executed a lease deed for the H2/H3 plot for 99 years with a renewal clause. In 1989, 47 of these lessors executed registered deeds surrendering their rights, title, and interest in favor of the society. As a result, the society became the owner of approximately 86% of the land. However, the property card still reflects the society as a lessee, not an owner. The remaining 14-16% of the land is held by the Dhanwatey group, who are still recorded as lessors and are thus in the minority.

Mr. Tolat emphasized that in any future dispute or disagreement, the society as the majority owner should be able to dictate terms. Therefore, it is crucial that the property card be updated to reflect the society as the rightful owner. For this, Index II and the original documents must be submitted. While 47 documents were executed, 24 are still lying with the Collector's office. Despite repeated assurances, these documents have not been released.

Mr. Tolat reiterated his long-standing recommendation to file a writ petition to obtain these documents and perfect the society's title. He informed the members that the writ petition has already been drafted and is ready for filing; he is currently awaiting formal instructions from the Managing Committee (MC) to proceed.



Hon. Secretary then informed the members that the matter had been discussed in an MC meeting, and a resolution had been drafted and signed by the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, and handed over to Mr. Tolat. However, due to subsequent developments within the MC, it was decided to hold off temporarily.

He explained that with the impending appointment of a legal firm, the MC wishes to consolidate all legal matters under a single professional entity. Mr. Tolat would continue to play an integral role, but the intention is to first consult the to be appointed law firm, seek their advice, and then proceed with consensus as and when required.

He also noted that the scope of work document read out during the meeting was prepared by a professional and the MC had got it done at no cost to the society.

Mr. Sanjoy Das (B - 706) remarked that as Hon. Joint Secretary had mentioned earlier, the law firm would be preparing various agreements. However, he pointed out that standard drafts of such agreements are often freely available. If the firm prepares new drafts, it could lead to significant costs. He urged the committee to consider this before finalizing decisions.

He also suggested that all past legal matters and any errors made previously should be reviewed and corrected before moving forward.

Hon. Joint Secretary then referred to the *Scope of Work*, specifically *Point No. 1: Title Due Diligence and Advice*, which contains detailed subpoints from (a) to (i). He explained that the legal firm is expected to thoroughly examine all legal matters of the society under this section and provide further guidance.

Mr. Surendar Dugar (C - 608) inquired whether the *Scope of Work* read out by Mr. Khan was final or if more items would be added. He felt additional points should be included, especially regarding the lease, the Dhanwatey group, and related matters. He asked how many of the 72 individuals in the Dhanwatey group were part of the lease and requested details of the meeting held with the Dhanwatey group, stating that such information may not be confidential and should be shared.

Mrs. Rita Billimoria (B - 202) agreed with Mr. Dugar, adding that members are entirely unaware of developments involving the Dhanwatey group. If a meeting has taken place, the details should be made public.

Mr. Surendar Dugar (C - 608) also questioned why the property card had not yet been updated in the society's name and emphasized that PMC involvement is not required to initiate the process. He again urged that details of the meeting with the Dhanwatey group be shared.





Hon. Secretary responded by stating that all such details will be disclosed at the upcoming SGM scheduled for 18 May 2025.

Hon. Secretary informed the members about the quotations received from various law firms for handling the society's legal matters. The quotes, exclusive of GST (at 18%), were as follows:

1. L.D. Shah – ₹17.5 lakhs
2. MDP – ₹25 lakhs
3. ELP – ₹40 lakhs (subject to negotiation; details shared later)
4. ANB Legal – ₹50 lakhs
5. Abhishek Sharma – ₹60 lakhs

The Managing Committee (MC) and Redevelopment Committee (RDC) jointly held detailed discussions with all five firms: each meeting lasting more than an hour. Out of the total 24 members in the MC and RDC around 10 members actively participated in these meetings.

Each firm was thoroughly evaluated based on various criteria, including domain expertise, past experience, and the nature of their legal work. After comprehensive evaluation, the committees decided to engage ELP (Economic Law Practice). Notably, Mr. Sudip Mullick, a highly experienced lawyer formerly with Khaitan & Co. and a specialist in Real Estate, Construction, and Hospitality law with over three decades of experience, has recently joined ELP. Another respected senior partner, Ms. Heena Chadha a highly acclaimed legal professional is also part of the ELP team.

ELP had initially quoted ₹44 lakhs, which was negotiated down to ₹40 lakhs and then further reduced to ₹38 lakhs plus GST. They have expressed their commitment to supporting the society throughout the process, provided timely progress is maintained. Their standard engagement period is 18 months, extendable up to 24 months. If necessary, they may allow an additional extension of up to 2 more months.

Hon. Secretary also shared positive news that the legal expenses will be reimbursed by the developer, easing the financial burden on the society.

There were some concerns about whether the entire *Scope of Work* could be completed within the stipulated timeline. The Secretary reassured members that ELP is confident about completing the scope within 18 to 21 months, with flexibility to extend up to 24 months, or slightly beyond if required.

In conclusion, the Hon. Secretary emphasized that the Poonam project is a prestigious one, and this has attracted keen interest from all the legal firms approached.

Mr. Prashant Das (A - 602) expressed concern over the rising number of expenses being incurred by the society. He highlighted three major upcoming costs:



1. Payment to the newly appointed law firm
2. Appointment and fees of the Project Management Consultant (PMC)
3. Structural repair work for beams and columns

He urged the Managing Committee (MC) and Redevelopment Committee (RDC) to consider giving members some financial breathing room, as everyone needs to manage their personal budgets accordingly.

Hon. Secretary responded by reminding members that when the ₹50 lakh budget for the law firm was originally approved, it was agreed that the amount would be collected in three instalments. However, since the final negotiated fee with ELP is now ₹38 lakhs (plus GST), the payment schedule can be reconsidered based on members' comfort. He suggested the possibility of splitting the amount into four instalments instead of three, if that helps ease the burden.

Based on the revised cost, the quarterly share would come to approximately ₹18,000 per unit. The Secretary also sought member input on whether the contribution should be calculated per unit or per square foot.

Mrs. Shefali Jain (A - 708) raised the concern that charging per unit is unfair, as members own different-sized flats some 1BHK, some 3BHK or 4BHK. She advocated that the charges should instead be levied on a per square foot basis.

Hon. Secretary clarified that, as per legal norms, the standard is to charge per unit, including for maintenance. However, to ensure fairness and legal accuracy, he proposed that a legal opinion be obtained to confirm whether such charges should be levied per unit or per square foot. He emphasized that both legal and maintenance charges should follow the same basis to maintain consistency.

He also gave the members the option to decide the matter internally, without involving legal counsel, if a consensus could be reached during the meeting.

Hon. Secretary concluded that an amount of **₹45 lakhs (including GST)** would be collected in **three quarterly instalments**. The method of calculation **per unit or per square foot** would be finalized after obtaining legal advice.

He further confirmed that the society has now officially decided to onboard **ELP (Economic Law Practice)** to handle all legal matters related to the redevelopment project.





**Resolved that** *Economic Laws Practice (ELP)* be appointed as the legal firm to handle all legal matters pertaining to the proposed redevelopment of the Society.

**Further resolved that** the legal fees, as per ELP's quotation of ₹38 lakhs plus applicable GST, (totaling ₹45 lakhs) are hereby approved and the said amount of Rs. 5,475.00 (Rupees Five thousand four hundred and seventy-five only) shall be collected from each member in **three quarterly instalments**, commencing from **01 July 2025**, and shall be levied **on a per unit basis**.

Proposed by: Mr. Prashant Das (A - 602)  
Seconded by: Mr. Dilip Jhaveri (D - 603)

The Hon. Secretary expressed gratitude to all members for their support on the matter. The meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

For Poonam Property CHS Ltd.

Hon. Secretary

