ROOF TOP CO-OP. HOUSING SOCIETY LTD.

REGD. NO. BOM / HSG / 4621 OF 1975

Mahakali Caves Road,
Andheri (East),
Mumbai-400 093.

Ref._____

Date: 17 JUN 2026

Final Minutes of Emergency SGBM held on 12April26 at 4pm on CHS premises

Note to all members: No resolutions can ever be passed in a meeting with a sole agenda declared as "Open Discussion", as such a meeting only comprises of an unstructured, free-flowing dialogue to share ideas, voice opinions and ask questions to the leadership panel (i.e. the Society Managing Committee).

For any resolution to be tabled and subsequently passed, it needs to be: -

1) Explicitly mentioned in the agenda, such that all members are well aware as to what business will be conducted during the meeting and make themselves available to support or oppose said resolution,

2) Adequate notice period has to be provided as per byelaws, such that members may make themselves available to support or oppose said resolution,

3) Agenda resolution needs to be tabled by the Managing Committee during the meeting with the subsequent support and opposition recorded by a show of hands, etc., and,

4) Any resolution mentioned in the agenda, which is subsequently tabled and adopted by General Body is still null and void if it is in violation of prevailing laws.

Having mentioned the above, no resolution was passed nor could have been passed during this meeting. Additionally, any resolution to defer Redevelopment process is automatically rendered null and void as it is directly in violation of Section 79a of MCS Act, as well as Redevelopment GR2019. The law states that a redevelopment process can start at any point in time once 51% members provide their consent in a duly constituted SGBM. In the case of Rooftop CHS, once 57 members out of total of 112 members provide their written consent for Redevelopment, the process can legally start.

For ROOF TOP CHS. LTD.

HON. SECRETARY

SGBM Agenda: Open discussion on Redevelopment

Official Minutes of Meeting [Final]

1) Chairperson referred to the letter received from 42 members regarding their concerns about Redevelopment, which stated that these members were not opposed to Redevelopment, but they requested the MC that such a process be carried out with transparency and in a legally complaint manner under Section 79A. Chairperson declared that all legal measures including Section 79a for Redevelopment had been followed by MC, and that Redevelopment process had not been started. He further informed that PMC's had been called to inform members and their families through a presentation, regarding the redevelopment process based on written requests received by MC from members interested in redevelopment.

2) Secretary briefed all members about the specific concerns of 42 members which included: -

Concern 1) Redevelopment consents being acquired from members: Secretary clarified that the Redevelopment applications received from members were not consents, but letters of interest stating that those members were interested in Redevelopment for various reasons and needed MC to provide information on benefits that the members could get based on current redevelopment rules set by Government. Based on these formal written applications, MC had merely arranged redevelopment presentation for general awareness. He clarified that MC does not have any consent letters from members, nor has any PMC being appointed.

Concern 2) Physical distribution of printed copies of agenda-notice to all flats, Secretary stated that there were genuine concerns regarding health of aged security personnel climbing stairs of 6 buildings to distribute printed copies in the absence of lifts. He further informed members that security watchman Anil Singh had suffered a heart attack last year while on duty. Secretary added that MC had no problems with keeping physical copies of agenda-notice with security at the gate such that they can be collected by members as per convenience.

Concern 3) Formation of Vigilance Taskforce by General Body, Secretary confirmed that MC agreed with this viewpoint.

3) Mr. Karkera enquired whether PMC had been appointed based on ads given in newspapers and why was this decision not taken in an SGBM. Mr. Patel further enquired as to why: a) MC had approached members with a signature drive for consent to redevelopment, which was not the right approach in his

For ROOF TOP CHS. LTD.

HON. SECRETARY

opinion. In his view, an SGBM should have been called to discuss this matter. b) He further stated that he was unsure of redevelopment laws like GR2019 and Section 79A, but was opposed to the fact that the PMC ad was given without SGBM approval. To this Secretary repeated that no Redevelopment consents had been taken and no PMC had been appointed. He informed members that as per Government Regulation 2019 (GR2019), once Redevelopment applications are received from 1/5th members, MC has to mandatorily advertise for acquiring PMC quotations. He stated that the redevelopment applications were not consents, but formal letters of interest for which MC had to act as per GR2019, else MC would be in violation of prevailing laws. He assured members that all rules had been followed by MC.

4) Mr. Karkera stated that he had doubts on structural audit report received from Arvind Singh Consultants, which classified society as C2B category stating that major repairs need to be done. He advised that CHS should get another independent structural engineer and do a second structural audit. Mr. Patel added that he had studied the audit report, which indicated that buildings were fit for residing, provided repair work was carried out. However, he stated that the NDT test reports declared that the buildings were not fit for residing. This contradiction, according to him, was needed to be verified by MC.

5) Mr. Patel further compared repair quotations received from Arvind Singh Consultants with expenses incurred during major repairs undertaken by Society in 2022. He stated that the repair quotations of Arvind Singh were exorbitant and were not required, as according to him, the buildings were in good condition. He also informed that the polymer-based plaster (painting) work done in 2022 at the cost of Rs.21 Lakhs was weather proof and he did not see any reason why the current structural audit report required painting to be redone. Mr. Patel further enquired with previous Secretary, Mr. Suraj D. Naik, whether the Society had acquired a warranty for the plaster and Dulux paint used in 2022 major repairs, to which Mr. Naik announced that Society had acquired a warranty of 8-10 years, which was further repeated by Mr. Patel to all members present. To this, the Chairperson responded that the MC was not considering the structural audit as a basis for Redevelopment, and that the General Body can freely decide whether to go or not go for Redevelopment. He added that the structural audit has to be done every 3 years as required, and has been done now, with the quotations provided as estimates.

For ROOF TOP CHS. LTD.

HON. SECRETARY

6) Mr. Patel enquired as to why Arvind Singh Consultants was appointed by the MC to do the structural audit and why NDT tests were done. To this Secretary responded that it was the previous committee which had appointed and paid Arvind Singh Consultants to do the audit before the current MC took the handover. He informed members that the Society had been using Arvind Singh as structural audit consultants for past 20 years. He further clarified that NDT tests were carried out by Arvind Singh through an independent lab as a part of their structural audit. He reminded members that during the SGBM held on 1st February 2026, the General Body had asked MC to acquire repair quotes from Arvind Singh Consultants based on structural audit report, and MC had simply procured the quotes from Arvind Singh Consultants. In response to Mr. Karkera's earlier point about having doubts on Arvind Singh's structural audit report, Secretary stated that another structural audit can be called for from an independent consultant to get repair quotes to compare. Mr. Karkera agreed to this.

7) Mr. Vandrewala stated that not many members were aware about the Society plot being in reservation under Affordable Housing scheme of Maharashtra Government and the redevelopment benefits we could get due to this. He further informed members that Society did not have its name under revenue records, the society plot subdivision had not been done in collectors office, and Society did not have a property card. He stated that no PMC had been appointed, but PMC's had been invited to come and inform us about the Redevelopment process, along with regularization of our society records, which they do on behalf of societies. He informed that a normal Redevelopment process takes many years, but ensuring that the society name is duly mentioned in government documents should be undertaken first.

8) Mr. Karkera responded that the Society's name was mentioned in Index II, and the Society had conveyance deed in its favor, but he also clarified that the Society had only partial OC, as all the top floors did not have OC. He further informed members that when he was Secretary he had made an application to the Government for securing OC for its top floors, but after his tenure finished, no one followed it up. Secretary responded to Mr. Karkera that he had come across his application file in the society office after current MC took over and had studied it, however, the process is still incomplete, and that the Society could finish the work he had initiated to get all the records cleared in Government departments. Secretary also reaffirmed that Society did not have OC for all its top floors and pressed for the need to appoint an Architect who could get the job done through proper govt channels as society cannot do this

For ROOF TOP CHS. LTD.

HON. SECRETARY

on its own, further concluding that our plot should be completely in our names. Mr. Karkera and members agreed to this.

9) Mr. Vandrewala agreed with the Secretary that Society did not have OC for all the top floors and informed members that Maharashtra Gov had launched an amnesty scheme for societies to get OC without penalty for which deadline was July 2026, after which 100% penalty (60% of ready reckoner rate) is applicable. Mr. Karkera agreed that Society needs to make efforts to get OC for our top floors. He further informed members that Redevelopment is of two types: through builder, which is problematic, and thru self, which involves lots of struggle. He highlighted that these issues need to be discussed and passed in SGBM, but a sub-committee needs to be formed first, which would include present Chairman and Secretary, as well as previous Chairman and Secretary, along with seniors and Civil engineers like Mr. Vandrewala, etc.

10) Mr. Mukhija stated that the buildings can sustain with repairs. He suggested to "defer the decision of Redevelopment till next structural audit report of 2028", and asked members, "Is it fair enough?". Mr. Patel stated that repairs need to be ongoing. Secretary clarified to Mr. Mukhija and Mr. Patel that MC had already started small-scale repairs through repair and housekeeping contractor, Mr. Sharnappa, and in case General Body wanted to appoint another contractor they can do so, till which time Mr. Sharnappa will continue for small day to day maintenance. Mr. Patel appreciated the MC initiative and clarified that Mr. Sharnappa can be used for minor repairs, but he was not fit to do major repairs. He stated that major repair work should be done in a reasonable time and at reasonable cost by a professional, and that he doesn't mind paying extra charges towards these repairs. He added that as buildings need to be maintained, he had full trust in MC to get a good contractor to do the major repairs. Secretary responded that he was in full agreement with Mr. Patel's views.

11) Secretary reminded members that in June 2025, he had personally assisted the previous MC in repairs when monsoonal leakages started, and he would welcome members to step up and help the current committee at this time. Members agreed to this. Chairperson stated that the General Body can decide whether they want to go for Redevelopment or not, and MC will abide accordingly. He further advised that a repair sub-committee could be formed to work with MC to undertake the major repairs that are required urgently.

For ROOF TOP CHS. LTD.

HON. SECRETARY

12) Mrs. Oza complained about the high cost of repairs of ceilings and walls which society and members had to bear every few years, and stated that Redevelopment process needs to be started. MC member Mr. Ashish Saharia gave an example of his flat in another society [name withheld] facing leakages within 1 year of possession. Mrs. Oza responded saying that leakages were one issue, but when the ceiling concrete slabs of her flat collapse, the RCC steel rebars inside were completely damaged. Mr. Ashish Saharia agreed saying that part of his kitchen ceiling slabs had also collapsed on his washing machine. Secretary informed members that such cases of concrete slabs collapsing due to corroded RCC rebars are frequently happening inside the flats, and members should report when cracks first start forming and not wait for them to open up and collapse, thereby endangering lives. He informed members about the flat belonging to Mr. Khan (B40), where concrete slabs collapsed on the bed, but fortunately no one was under it. He alerted members that one of these days a major incident could happen and create problems for the Society. Mrs. Oza protested about members continuing to do these expensive repairs at their own expense and clarified that this is the major reason to start Redevelopment process. Secretary responded that the Society can initiate Redevelopment process, but in the meantime, repairs need to happen to avoid any untoward incident.

13) Mrs. Oza asked the Society to bear all types of repair costs through society funds, to which Mr. Ashish Saharia enquired whether a resolution could be passed to undertake ceiling repairs of all flats on societies expense, to which Secretary replied that this is not permitted under society byelaws. He stated that Society can undertake repairs in flats for water leakages directly from the terraces and external walls only. He further cautioned members that General Body cannot pass resolutions, which violate prevailing laws, and that we all needed to follow the laws laid down by the Government. Mr. Mukhija added that most members had installed false ceilings and any ceiling repairs done by society could be exorbitant.

14) Mrs. Kambli stated that the number of senior citizens residing on top floors require Redevelopment for provision of lifts, and as buildings are more than 50 years old, Redevelopment process should commence while repairs take place on the sidelines.

15) Mrs. Oza vehemently protested against false narratives, allegations and rumors being spread by some members against the MC regarding Redevelopment, to which Secretary responded that the MC will not stoop down

For ROOF TOP CHS. LTD.

HON. SECRETARY

to the level of such members as we were all better than this, further stating that the MC will not indulge in such low thinking.

16) The Secretary reminded all members that demands for Redevelopment is an ongoing process and should be welcomed, and whatever needs to be done in this regard can be decided by the General Body, as and when the time comes, however repairs need to be ongoing till Redevelopment decision can be finalized. He declared that he stood with all 112 members and no outside influence shall be allowed to interfere in society matters as the 112 members were more than enough to resolve any issues by themselves. He also informed members that in 2018 he was inducted by founder member, Mr. N.B. Saharia, as the youngest member of the Redevelopment Committee to acquire a feasibility report from a PMC, and that he had efficiently done his duty then by assisting all the founder members in every way possible. He reminded all members that he and his family had always supported the society during times of great turmoil.

17) MC member, Mrs. Kambli, agreed with the Secretary that no outside influence should be allowed to interfere in society matters, but added that members saying that they do not want Redevelopment is not correct. She again advised that as redevelopment process takes a long time, it should be started while repairs are ongoing on the sidelines.

18) Mr. Mukhija gave the vote of thanks stating that the purpose for the meeting had been achieved and that he appreciated the clarification and understanding that members had received from MC, further declaring that there were no more differences between MC and those members who had concerns. He added that "it was clear that there was no hurry or anything under the table" and it was "all done transparently and through the proper route". He ended the meeting with his thanks towards all the efforts taken.

For and on behalf of Rooftop CHS Managing Committee

For ROOF TOP CHS. LTD.

HON. SECRETARY

Mr. Abhijit Gatade

ROOF-TOP CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING SOCIETY LTD
Reg. No. BOM/HSG/4621 of 1975
ANDHERI (EAST), BOMBAY