

21st November, 2025

Scrip Code : ANSALAPI
National Stock Exchange of
India Limited
Exchange Plaza,
Bandra-Kurla Complex,
Bandra (East)
Mumbai – 400 051

Scrip Code: 500013
BSE Limited
25th Floor,
Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers
Dalal Street,
Mumbai – 400 001

- Reg:** Post intimation for the Minutes of Forty Fourth (44th) Meeting of the Committee of Creditors of 'Fernhill Project' of Ansal Properties and Infrastructure Limited (APIL or Company) situated at District Gurgaon, Haryana, held on the 19th November, 2025.
- Ref:** i Prior intimation for 44th Meeting of the Committee of Creditors for 'Fernhill project' of Ansal Properties and Infrastructure Limited (APIL), situated at District Gurgaon, Haryana, to be held on the 19th November 2025 submitted on 17th November, 2025.
- ii Vide Order dated the 13th January, 2023 of Hon'ble National Company Law Appellate Tribunal, New Delhi (NCLAT) - Adjudicating Authority admitting Section 7 application shall confine to 'Fernhill project' situated at District Gurgaon (Initially, APIL was admitted into Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process vide Order dated the 16th November, 2022 passed by the Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal, New Delhi Bench, Court-II).
- iii Regulation 30 of SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, as amended.

Dear Sir/Madam,

With reference to the captioned matter and in compliance with the Regulation 30 of SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, as amended, please find attached herewith the minutes of Forty Forth (44th) meeting of the Committee of Creditors of 'Fernhill Project' of Ansal Properties and Infrastructure Limited situated at District Gurgaon, Haryana, held on the 19th November, 2025, attached herewith as **Annexure 1**.

This is for your information and records.

Thanking you.

Yours faithfully,

For Ansal Properties and Infrastructure Limited

AGH-shekh

(Abdul Sami)
Company Secretary



- 1) Ansal Properties and Infrastructure Limited (APIL) is undergoing Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process under Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016. It's affairs, business and assets are being managed by Shri Navneet Kumar Gupta, Interim Resolution Professional (Currently designated as Resolution Professional), appointed by Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT), New Delhi, Bench IV, in CP No.: IB 558(ND)/2024 vide Order dated the 25th February, 2025.
- 2) The Serene Residency Group Housing Project of APIL, situated at Sector ETA – II, Greater Noida, U.P, is also managed by Shri Navneet Kumar Gupta, Resolution Professional of said Project. The Resolution Plan of the said project was approved by Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT), New Delhi, Bench II on the 06th October, 2025.
- 3) The Fernhill Project of APIL, situated at District Gurgaon, Haryana, is managed by Shri Jalesh Kumar Grover, Resolution Professional of the said Project.

Encl: a/a

Ansal Properties and Infrastructure Limited (IN CIRP)

115, Ansal Bhawan, 16, Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi-110 001

Tel.: 011-23353550, 011-66302268 / 69 Website: www.ansalapi.com CIN: L45101DL1967PLC004759

Email: info@ansalapi.com | cirpofapil@minervaresolutions.com

MINUTES OF THE FORTY FOURTH MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE OF CREDITORS (“COC”) IN THE MATTER OF M/S ANSAL PROPERTIES & INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED (FERNHILL PROJECT, GURUGRAM) HELD ON 19TH NOVEMBER, 2025 AT 01:00 P.M. THROUGH VIRTUAL MODE

PRESENT IN THE MEETING

A. RESOLUTION PROFESSIONAL & TEAM

NAME	DESIGNATION	MODE OF PRESENCE
Mr. Jalesh Kumar Grover	Resolution Professional/ Chairman	Physical
Ms. Oshin Thakur	Team Members of RP	Physical
Ms. Riya	Team Members of RP	Physical
Ms. Muskaan	Team Members of RP	Physical
Ms. Kanika Sachdeva	Team Members of RP	Audio-Visual

B. FINANCIAL CREDITOR:

SR. NO.	NAME OF FINANCIAL CREDITOR	REPRESENTED BY	MODE OF PRESENCE
1.	Authorized Representative of Home Buyers	Ms. Aakriti Sood	Audio visual
2.	Saurabh Gupta (Flat no. K/1004)	Self	Audio visual
3.	Naveen Gupta (Villa no- GH 021)	Self	Audio visual
4.	Mukti Kanta Sukla (Flat no. M/0002)	Self	Audio visual
5.	Shishir Kumar (Flat no. F/1602)	Self	Audio visual

6.	Chander Parkash (Flat No. D-0601)	Self	Audio visual
7.	Rajeev Bhatia (Flat No. 0103)	Self	Audio visual
8.	OP Girdhar (Flat No. A/804)	Self	Audio visual
9.	Naveen Arora (Unit No.- J 803)	Self	Audio visual
10.	Anil Bansal (Flat No.E/401)	Self	Audio visual
11.	Anil Yadav	Self	Audio visual
12.	Ashish Mehra (Flat No. D/401)	Self	Audio visual
13.	RC Kochar (Flat no. K/404)	Self	Audio visual
14.	Vinay Mittal (Unit No.- L- 302)	Self	Audio visual
15.	Varun Gupta (Unit No.- B- 1204)	Self	Audio visual
16.	Kartik Sharma (Unit No.- C- 502)	Self	Audio visual
17.	Prashant Sahu Unit No.- M- 501)	Self	Audio visual
18.	Pritam Pal (Unit No.- P- 301)	Self	Audio visual
19.	Rakesh Kumar Prasher	Self	Audio visual
20.	Anupam Garg (Unit No.- H- 1102)	Self	Audio visual
21.	Munish Abrol (Unit No.- B- 1101)	Self	Audio visual
22.	Kushal Gupta	Self	Audio visual

23.	Aakash	Self	Audio visual
24.	Anand (Unit No.- B- 1004)	Self	Audio visual
25.	Bibuthi Bhushan Biswas	Self	Audio visual
26.	Gaurav	Self	Audio visual
27.	Gopal Pathak (Unit No.- E- 12A02)	Self	Audio visual
28.	Manish Rana	Self	Audio visual
29.	Mayank Tandon	Self	Audio visual
30.	Rita Gupta	Self	Audio visual
31.	Aruna Bhatia	Self	Audio visual
32.	Naveen Nangia	Self	Audio visual
33.	Rajni	Self	Audio visual
34.	Sameer Sharma	Self	Audio visual
35.	Sanjiv Kumar	Self	Audio visual
36.	Charan Singh	Self	Audio visual
37.	Ravendera	Self	Audio visual
38.	Sumit Sheoan	Self	Audio visual
39.	Vineet Kumar	Self	Audio visual
40.	Saurabh Gupta	Self	Audio visual
41.	Yogesh Mangla	Self	Audio visual
42.	Sanjay Dhar	Self	Audio visual
43.	Vikas Gulia	Self	Audio visual
44.	Ankit	Self	Audio visual
45.	Puneet Madan	Self	Audio visual
46.	Bhupesh	Self	Audio visual
47.	Sanjiv Khera	Self	Audio visual

48.	Rakesh Chadha	Self	Audio visual
49.	Raman	Self	Audio visual
50.	Satbir Singh	Self	Audio visual
51.	Punit Arora	Self	Audio visual
52.	Kiran	Self	Audio visual
53.	Aman	Self	Audio visual

C. UNSECURED FINANCIAL CREDITOR:

S. NO.	NAME OF THE UNSECURED FINANCIAL CREDITOR	MODE OF PRESENCE
1.	Vinod Kumar and Babita Saini	Audio visual

D. OPERATIONAL CREDITORS IF AGGREGATE DUES ARE ATLEAST 10% OF THE TOTAL DEBT: Not Applicable.

E. SUSPENDED BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF ANSAL PROPERTIES INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED (FERNHILL PROJECT, GURUGRAM) ('CD')

NAME	DESIGNATION	MODE OF PRESENCE
Mr. Pranav Ansal	Director (Whole-Time Director)	Absent
Mr. Deepak Mowar	Director (Additional Director)	Absent
Mr. Binay Kumar Singh	Director (Additional Director)	Absent
Ms. Francette Patricia	Director (Additional Director)	Absent

POST NOTICE EVENT

1. The notice of the 44th meeting of CoC was sent 4 days prior to the CoC meeting i.e., 15.11.2025 by electronic means at the Email id of the Authorized Representative of Home Buyers, unsecured financial creditor and Directors (Powers Suspended) of Corporate Debtor, as per the record handed over by the Erstwhile RP and obtained from Public Domain.

2. The Authorized Representative of Home Buyers was also informed by the team of Resolution Professional about the 44th CoC meeting telephonically to ensure receipt of notice and also took confirmation for their participation.
3. The notice was sent to the Directors (Powers Suspended) of corporate debtor at their email ids available on the MCA portal.
4. The link to attend the meeting was shared with Authorized Representative of Home Buyers, unsecured financial creditor and Directors (Powers Suspended) of Corporate Debtor along with the notice on 15.11.2025.

CONDUCT OF THE MEETING

The meeting started at around 01:00 P.M. Approximately Fifty -Two (52) Homebuyers virtually joined the COC meeting, however, despite multiple requests from the RP, certain homebuyers did not mention their name along with details of their respective units. Further, Ms. Aakriti Sood (Authorized Representative of Home Buyers) as well as Mr. Vinod Kumar Saini, unsecured financial creditor also participated virtually.

The RP and his team members attended the meeting physically from Chandigarh Office. Further, one of the team members of RP joined the meeting through audio-video means. The attendance of the participants who were present in the meeting was marked by the team members of RP, who attended the meeting.

Mr. Jalesh Kumar Grover, Resolution Professional of M/s Ansal Properties & Infrastructure Limited (Fernhill Project, Gurugram), for conducting its Insolvency Resolution Process took the chair and the meeting was called to order.

1. The Chairperson took the roll call of all the participants attending the meeting and announced their name, the name of the members of COC whom they were representing, and a confirmation was taken from every participant that they have received the agenda and notice of the meeting.
2. The Chairman enquired whether any belated claimant had joined the meeting and, if so, requested them to exit, as they are not members of the CoC, yet.
3. The Chairperson informed the participants that the required quorum is complete and meeting

can be proceeded with and also informed the participants that the meeting shall have the presence of quorum throughout the meeting.

4. The Chairperson also informed the participants that as per Regulation 25(5) of IBBI (Insolvency Resolution Process of Corporate Persons) Regulations, 2016. The resolution professional shall:

(a.) Circulate the minutes of the meeting by electronic means to all members of the committee and the authorized representative, if any, within forty-eight hours of the conclusion of the meeting; and

(b.) Seek a vote of the members who did not vote at the meeting on the matters listed for voting, by electronic voting system in accordance with Regulation 26 where the voting shall be kept open from the circulation of the minutes, for such time as decided by the committee which shall not be

(c.) less than twenty-four hours and shall not exceed seven days:

Provided that on a request for extension made by a creditor, the voting window shall be extended in increments of twenty-four hours period:

Provided further that the Resolution Professional shall not extend the voting window where the matters listed for voting have already received the requisite majority vote and one extension has been given after the receipt of requisite majority vote.

(d.) As per Regulation 25 (6) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (Insolvency Resolution Process for Corporate Persons) Regulations 2016, the Authorised Representative shall circulate the minutes of the meeting received under sub-regulation (5) to creditors in a class and announce the voting window at least twenty-four hours before the window opens for voting instructions and keep the voting window open for at least twelve hours.

MATTERS DISCUSSED/NOTED FOR INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM NO. 44.01

THE RESOLUTION PROFESSIONAL TO TAKE CHAIR OF THE MEETING AS PER REGULATION 24 OF THE IBBI (CIRP) REGULATIONS, 2016

Mr. Jalesh Kumar Grover, having registration number IBBI/IPA-001/IP-P00200/2017-2018/10390 was appointed as Resolution Professional ('RP') in the matter of M/s Ansal Properties and Infrastructure Limited (Fernhill Project, Gurugram) by the Hon'ble NCLT, New Delhi Bench, Court– II vide its order dated 10.01.2024.

In accordance with Regulation 24(1) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (Insolvency Resolution Process for Corporate Persons) Regulations, 2016, Mr. Jalesh Kumar Grover, Resolution Professional of M/s Ansal Properties and Infrastructure Limited (Fernhill Project, Gurugram) took the Chair as Chairperson and the meeting was called to order.

The committee took note of the same.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 44.02

TO ASCERTAIN THE QUORUM OF THE MEETING AS PER REGULATION 22 OF IBBI (CIRP) REGULATIONS, 2016

The Chairman apprised the committee that as per Regulation 22(1) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (Insolvency Resolution Process for Corporate Persons) Regulations, 2016, the quorum for the meeting of the committee of creditors is achieved if members of the committee representing at least 33% of the voting rights are present either in person or by video conferencing or other audio-visual means; provided that the committee may modify the percentage of voting rights required for quorum in respect of any future meetings of the committee.

Pursuant to the above provisions, the Chairman ascertained that the requisite quorum is present as Ms. Aakriti Sood, Authorized Representatives of the allottees as well as Mr. Vinod Kumar Saini (Unsecured Financial Creditor) having 100% voting rights in the COC, are present at the meeting and accordingly, the COC meeting was declared open.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 44.03

TO GRANT LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO THE MEMBERS, IF ANY

The Chairman apprised that no request for grant of leave has been received by the RP. Hence, no leave of absence was granted to any member/participant. The Chairman further apprised that the Directors (powers suspended) of the CD did not attend the meeting/ never attended the meeting, in spite of due service of notices to them.

The Committee took note of the same.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 44.04

TO APPROVE AND CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE 43rd COC MEETING HELD ON 23rd OCTOBER, 2025 AT 12:30 PM.

The Chairman apprised the committee that the minutes of the Forty Third COC meeting held on 23.10.2025 as approved by the RP had been circulated to all the participants electronically within 48 hours of the meeting i.e., on 25.10.2025 in accordance with Regulation 24, sub-regulation (7) of the IBBI (CIRP) Regulations, 2016. A copy of the minutes of the 43rd COC meeting was attached with the notice of the instant meeting as Annexure-44.04.01.

The Chairman requested the committee to share their observations, if any, on the minutes of the 43rd COC meeting dated 25.10.2025. No observations were received from AR / any members in this regard.

Accordingly, the minutes of the 43rd COC meeting held on 23.10.2025 stood approved by the members of the committee.

AGENDA ITEM NO-44.05

TO APPRISE THE COMMITTEE REGARDING THE STATUS OF ONGOING LITIGATIONS

The Chairman apprised the CoC that all the matters were listed for hearing on 17.11.2025. During the course of the hearing, after considering the submissions made by the parties in the Applications pertaining to admission of claims by the Resolution Professional, the Hon'ble Bench observed that

the SRA may address the said claims, as these were duly reflected in the books and accounts of the Corporate Debtor and were also verifiable as per the Resolution Professional. The counsel of SRA, on instructions stated that he is willing to address all the objections to the resolution plan. After hearing the counsels in detail, the Hon'ble Bench, including the counsel for the SRA, was pleased to remand the Resolution Plan submitted by the SRA back to the CoC for reconsideration in accordance with judicial precedents. Consequently, I.A. No. 28 of 2024 (Plan Approval Application) stood disposed of. The RP was also present physically before the Hon'ble NCLT on 17.11.2025.

The Chairman further apprised the CoC that, in view of the disposal of the Approval of Resolution Plan Application, the Hon'ble Bench was also pleased to dispose of the following Applications: IA-3704/ND/2024, IA-3730/ND/2024, IA-3702/ND/2024, IA-4008/ND/2024, IA-4056/ND/2024, IA-4171/ND/2024, IA-4252/ND/2024, IA-4597/ND/2024, IA-4995/ND/2024, IA-6086/ND/2024, IA-1986/ND/2025, IA-2303/ND/2025, IA-4581/ND/2025, IA-4657/ND/2025, IA-4660/ND/2025, IA-4661/ND/2025, IA-4697/ND/2025, IA-5011/ND/2025, IA-5052/ND/2025 and IA-5173/ND/2024.

The RP further apprised the CoC that thereafter, the counsel for the RP apprised the Hon'ble Bench regarding I.A. No. 4742 of 2025 filed by the RP regarding the non-cooperation of Samyak Projects in view of the Order dated 06.06.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Bench. Meanwhile, Mr. Rachit Mittal, Counsel for the Homebuyers' Association, submitted that an application bearing I.A. No. 3664/ND/2025 had been filed by him against Samyak Projects pursuant to the Order dated 06.06.2025 seeking expansion of the CIRP. After hearing both sides, including Senior Counsel Mr. Vivek Kohli appearing for Samyak Projects, the Hon'ble Bench listed all the Applications filed in terms of the Order dated 06.06.2025 for further consideration on 28.11.2025.

The copy of order dated 17.11.2025 has not yet been uploaded on the official website of NCLT. Once the order is uploaded, the RP shall apprise the CoC accordingly.

The RP further informed that the objection application filed by the homebuyers, except that of *Samyak*, now stand disposed of being infructuous. On a query by one of the Homebuyers, the RP clarified that If any application other than applications filed by Samyak still remain listed during next date of hearing, the counsel of RP will apprise the Hon'ble NCLT on the next date of hearing i.e., 28.11.2025, so that the same may also be disposed of.

Thereafter, the Authorised Representatives of Homebuyers sought clarification on whether the entire Resolution Plan has been referred back to the CoC or only the portion relating to belated claims. The RP clarified that the plan has been referred back for consideration on all the objections to the resolution plan.

The AR further enquired whether the RP will be presenting the Resolution Plan as a fresh plan or in the form of an addendum. The RP clarified that this will depend on the SRA. The RP stated that all objections raised in the plan must be addressed. The RP informed that the SRA has been requested to prepare a sheet/note specifying the changes proposed to address all objections, whether through an addendum or a revised Resolution Plan. Once the same is received, the RP will prepare a summary comparing the earlier plan with the proposed addendum or revised plan.

The AR also enquired whether the issue regarding the 42% threshold will be addressed in the Resolution Plan. The RP confirmed that all objections, including those related to the 42% threshold, will be addressed in the revised proposal. The objective is to ensure that the revised plan, once filed before the Hon'ble NCLT, is approved expeditiously.

Thereafter, the RP apprised the CoC that the updated status of each ongoing litigations in the matter of M/s Ansal Properties & Infrastructure Limited (Fernhill Project, Gurugram), will be shared with the CoC after the order is uploaded on the NCLT website.

The Committee took note of the same.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 44.06

TO APPRISE THE COMMITTEE REGARDING DISBURSEMENT OF REMAINING AMOUNT OF COC APPROVED INTERIM FINANCE OF RS. 23 LAKHS FOR MEETING CIRP EXPENSES IN THE MATTER OF ANSAL PROPERTIES & INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED (FERNHILL PROJECT, GURUGRAM)

The Chairman apprised the committee that the CoC through e-voting results dated 07.08.2024 on the agendas discussed in the 29th CoC meeting held on 01.08.2024 approved the proposal for raising Interim Finance from Kabirdas Investments Limited amounting to Rs. 50 Lakhs, at an interest rate of 18% per annum, compounded annually, for meeting the CIRP expenses in the matter of Ansal Properties & Infrastructure Limited (Fernhill Project, Gurugram).

Pursuant to the said approval, the Resolution Professional obtained the first tranche of the CoC-approved Interim Finance amounting to Rs. 27 Lakhs in the month of August, 2024 for meeting the urgent CIRP-related payments.

Subsequently, the Resolution Professional has now obtained the remaining amount of Interim Finance of Rs. 23 Lakhs, as certain expenses are foreseeable in Fernhill Project such as Security expenses, installation of surveillance cameras at the project site, and payment of monthly professional fees to the site manager.

Further, there are several service providers and professionals who have been regularly following up with the Resolution Professional for settlement of their outstanding dues.; even the erstwhile RP has repeatedly sent mails for payment of his dues and, as is known to the Committee, has also filed an application before the Hon'ble NCLT seeking payment of the same.

The RP further apprised the CoC Members that the security service provider at the Project Site (Gurugram – Fernhill), *Perfect Manpower Security Agency*, has been replaced with *Jupiter Administrative & Security Services Pvt. Ltd* with effect from 04.11.2025. Consequently, the RP is required to settle the pending dues of the erstwhile security agency and ensure timely payments to the newly appointed agency at regular intervals. Further, since there is no cash flow in the project, it became necessary to obtain the remaining amount of Interim Finance to meet these essential expenses. Accordingly, the Resolution Professional, vide email dated 27.10.2025, requested M/s Kabirdas Investments Private Limited for disbursement of the balance amount of ₹23,00,000/-. Pursuant to the said request, M/s Kabirdas Investments Private Limited has disbursed the said amount on 07.11.2025.

The RP further apprised the members that the details of disbursements already made and now proposed will be presented in the next CoC meeting. The RP further assured the members that the disbursements pertain only to urgent expenses and do not include the fee of the RP.

The COC took note of the same.

RESOLUTION TO BE PASSED IN THE MEETING

AGENDA ITEM NO. 44.07

TO RATIFY THE APPOINTMENT OF NEW SECURITY AGENCY FOR PROVIDING SECURITY SERVICES AT THE AT THE FERNHILL PROJECT SITE.

The Chairman apprised the Committee of Creditors that, as informed during the 42nd CoC meeting, pursuant to the Hon'ble NCLT order dated 06.06.2025 and DTCP approval, the RP took steps to commence construction and fit-out activities at the Project site. Upon which, the representatives of Samyak Projects Private Limited accompanied by two police personnel, unlawfully interfered and directed the immediate stoppage of all on-site activities, despite being apprised of the binding NCLT Order dated 06.06.2025 as well as the valid DTCP approval obtained for the Project.

The RP further apprised the CoC members that, in view of the aforesaid incident and the ensuing security concerns, it was deemed necessary to enhance the security arrangements at the Project site to ensure safety of the premises, workmen, and assets. Accordingly, the existing security service provider, *Perfect Manpower Security Agency*, has been replaced with *Jupiter Administrative & Security Services Pvt. Ltd.*, with effect from 04.11.2025. The newly appointed security agency has deployed the following personnel at the site:

- (a) Four (4) Security Guards – Two (2) for the day shift and two (2) for the night shift – at a fee of Rs. 26,104.3/- (exclusive of GST under RCM) per Security Guard;
- (b) One (1) Security Supervisor at a fee of Rs.31,449.48/- (exclusive of GST payable under RCM); and
- (c) Two (2) Gunmen at a fee of Rs. 32,774.52 (exclusive of GST payable under RCM) per Gunman.

The RP further apprised the Committee that the above-mentioned security personnel shall remain deployed at the Fernhill Project site on a 24-hour basis. The Security Supervisor shall remain on duty for 12 hours during the day, and the two Gunmen shall remain stationed for 12 hours during the night, to safeguard the property, prevent any unauthorized entry or interference, and ensure smooth continuation of the ongoing fit-out and related works. The enhanced security deployment is aimed at maintaining continuous vigilance and preventing recurrence of any untoward incidents that may hinder the progress of the Project.

The AR enquired about the reason for the replacement of the security agency. The RP clarified that following the incident involving *Samyak*, it became necessary to strengthen the security arrangements, and gunmen have also been deployed. The RP stated that it cannot be conclusively said whether there was a fault on the part of the earlier agency; however, enhanced security was required, and therefore a more competent agency has been appointed. The newly appointed agency is more responsible, though its charges are higher.

The AR requested that the increased security charges be specified. The RP informed the members that the details of the deployed security personnel have already been mentioned in the notice. With respect to the incremental amount, the RP apprised that the earlier monthly cost was Rs. 1,86,223/- which has now increased to Rs. 2,37,671/-.

Accordingly, the Chairman sought ratification of the appointment of the new security agency (*along with fee*) from the COC members.

After due discussion and deliberation upon the said matter, it was decided that the following resolutions shall be put for seeking approval of the COC members through e-voting:

Resolution

To consider and, if thought fit, to pass with or without modification the following resolution:

“**RESOLVED THAT** the appointment of security agency namely, M/s Jupiter Administrative & Security Services Pvt. Ltd., at a monthly fee of Rs. 2,37,671/- (*Rupees Two Lakhs Thirty-Seven Thousand Six Hundred Seventy-One only*) (inclusive of GST under RCM), be and is hereby ratified by the COC for providing security services at the Project Site of the corporate debtor (Fernhill Project) to safeguard the assets of the company.”

AGENDA ITEM NO. 44.08

TO RATIFY THE APPOINTMENT OF ADVOCATE SANKALP SRIVASTAVA FOR REPRESENTATION BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY (HRERA) AND APROVAL OF THE PROFESSIONAL FEE THEREOF

The Chairperson informed the members of the CoC that as discussed in the earlier CoC meeting, one matter was pending for execution before HRERA Gurugram titled as *Nitin Gupta and Nancy Gupta versus Ansal Properties & Infrastructure Limited (Fernhill Project)* which was listed for the hearing before the Hon'ble Bench on 22nd July 2025 at 11:00 AM. Therefore, it was necessary to appoint a legal counsel to represent the Resolution Professional before the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority (HRERA) in connection with the said matter.

Accordingly, the RP engaged Advocate Sankalp Srivastava vide appointment letter dated 18.07.2025, to appear and represent the CoC before HRERA at a lump sum fee of Rs. 1,500 (exclusive of GST), Since only one hearing is required to be done.

The RP further apprised the CoC that the aforesaid agenda was also discussed in the previous CoC meeting, wherein it was decided that the same will be taken up in the next CoC meeting.

Accordingly, the RP presented the agenda before the CoC for discussion and necessary ratification of the appointment of Advocate Sankalp Srivastava to represent the RP before HRERA.

After due discussion and deliberation upon the said matter, it was decided that the following resolutions shall be put for seeking approval of the COC members through e-voting:

Resolution:

To consider and, if thought fit, to pass with or without modification the following resolution:

RESOLVED THAT the Committee of Creditors hereby ratifies and approves the appointment of Advocate Sankalp Srivastava to represent the Resolution Professional before the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority (HRERA), Gurugram, in the matter titled *Nitin Gupta and Nancy Gupta versus Ansal Properties & Infrastructure Limited (Fernhill Project)* pending before HRERA at a lump sum fee of Rs. 1,500 (exclusive of GST).

FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the aforesaid fee shall form part of the CIRP Cost in terms of Section 5(13) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016.”

AGENDA ITEM NO. 44.09

TO RATIFY AND APPROVE THE APPOINTMENT OF CONSULTANTS ENGAGED/APPOINTED FOR ASSISTANCE AND GUIDANCE IN SECURING DTCP APPROVAL

The Chairperson apprised the Committee that as informed in the earlier meetings, pursuant to the letter submitted to the DTCP on 14.07.2025, seeking permission to recommence the fit-out and retrofitting works at the Fernhill Project Site, the DTCP, vide its communication dated 13.08.2025, granted the necessary clearance to resume fit-out and retrofitting works at the project site.

The RP apprised the CoC that for the said purpose the RP had appointed consultants for providing professional guidance in securing the requisite approval from the Department of Town and Country Planning (DTCP), Haryana, for resumption of fit-out and retrofitting works at the *Fernhill Project*, Sector-91, Gurugram.

The RP further apprised the Committee that the engagement of consultants was carried out after consultation with the Successful Resolution Applicant (SRA), *Krish Infrastructure Private Limited*, to ensure adherence to all procedural, and regulatory requirements in relation to the DTCP approval and for the reason that the said funds have been provided by SRA , being part of Interim Finance , in accordance with the terms of approved resolution plan. The consultants facilitated coordination with DTCP authorities, assisted in preparation and submission of required documentation and ensured timely receipt of approval, necessary for continuation of the project.

The RP informed the CoC members that the following professional consultants had been engaged, along with their respective fees, as detailed in the table below.

S. No.	Name of the Professional Consultant	Professional fee
1.	Khanna & Company (Poonam Rani)	10,00,000/-
2.	Arjun & Associates	17,00,000/-
3.	Y.P& Associates (Yas Pal)	13,00,000/-
4.	Gupta & Company (Karishma Chauhan)	5,00,000/-
5.	Vivek Attri	10,00,000/-

The RP further apprised the CoC that the fees of the appointed consultants had been paid, *after deduction of TDS*. The said amount was transferred by the SRA, *Krish Infrastructure Private Limited*, in to the CIRP account of the Corporate Debtor, following which the payment was released to the appointed Consultants. These expenses form part of the interim finance, which is required to be routed through the RP only.

The AR requested that, since this forms part of the CIRP cost, the scope of work of the consultants engaged by the SRA be provided. The RP clarified that the consultants are licensed professionals of the DTCP and undertake various categories of work. They were engaged based on the specific requirements at the relevant time. The RP further stated that brief details of their scope of work will be obtained from the SRA and shared accordingly.

The RP further apprised the CoC that the said amounts shall be treated as part of the CIRP Cost in accordance with the CoC-approved Resolution Plan dated 28.04.2025, read with the Addendum dated 03.06.2025, wherein an amount of Rs. 20 Crore has been proposed as interim finance.

Accordingly, the RP presented the agenda before the CoC for discussion and necessary ratification of the appointment of consultants for providing professional guidance in securing the requisite approval from the Department of Town and Country Planning (DTCP), Haryana.

After due discussion and deliberation upon the said matter, it was decided that the following resolutions shall be put for seeking approval of the COC members through e-voting:

Resolution:

To consider and, if thought fit, to pass with or without modification the following resolution:

RESOLVED THAT the Committee of Creditors hereby ratifies and approves the appointment of Professional Consultants (as mentioned in the table) to assist and advise the Resolution Professional in obtaining the requisite approval from the Department of Town and Country Planning (DTCP), Haryana, for the resumption of fit-out and retrofitting works at the *Fernhill Project, Sector-91, Gurugram*, at the professional fee as detailed in the table above.

FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the aforesaid fee shall form part of the CIRP Cost in terms of Section 5(13) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016.”

ANY OTHER MATTER:

AGENDA ITEM NO. 44.10

TO DISCUSS & SEEK APPROVAL OF EXCLUSION OF CIRP PERIOD ELAPSED SINCE THE FILING OF RESOLUTION PLAN APPLICATION AND FURTHER EXTENSION OF CIRP PERIOD BY 60 DAYS OF CIRP PERIOD AND TO AUTHORIZE THE RESOLUTION PROFESSIONAL TO MOVE APPLICATION(S) BEFORE HON’BLE NCLT, NEW DELHI BENCH SEEKING EXCLUSION AND EXTENSION OF CIRP PERIOD

The Chairman apprised the Committee of Creditors that the application for approval of the Resolution Plan was listed for hearing on 17.11.2025. After hearing the applications objecting the resolution plan, the Hon’ble NCLT directed that the Resolution Plan be remitted back to the CoC, for reconsideration, in accordance with judicial precedents. The RP further apprised the CoC that the copy of order dated 17.11.2025 has not yet been uploaded on the official website of NCLT. Since the order was dictated in the open court, the RP placed the agenda for the consideration and approval of COC.

The RP further apprised the CoC that the extended CIRP period was expired on 14.06.2024 and the application for the approval of the Resolution Plan had already been submitted before the Hon’ble

NCLT within the extended timeline. Accordingly, no further extension of the CIRP period was required at that stage. However, in light of the recent directions of the Hon'ble NCLT to reconsider the Resolution Plan, a further extension of 60 days from the date of the order is required, to enable detailed deliberations and to facilitate the reconsideration of the Resolution Plan in compliance with the Hon'ble NCLT's directions.

The RP further apprised the CoC that there is a requirement for exclusion of the CIRP period from 14.06.2024 (the last date of the extended CIRP period) until the application seeking further extension of the CIRP period is allowed by the Hon'ble NCLT.

Accordingly, in due compliance of the directions issued by the Hon'ble NCLT, the RP shall file an application with Hon'ble NCLT, wherein, the exclusion of the period from 14.06.2024 until the disposal of the extension application shall be prayed for, along with a further extension of CIRP Period by 60 days from the date of the order, to allow sufficient time for receipt of revised resolution plan, deliberations on the same, further modifications and placing the modified resolution plan on voting and subsequently filing an application with the Hon'ble NCLT for approval of revised resolution plan.

Accordingly, after due deliberations upon the agenda, it was decided that the following resolutions shall be put for seeking approval of the COC members through e-voting:

Resolution:

To consider and, if thought fit, to pass with or without modification the following resolution-

“RESOLVED THAT the CoC hereby approves to file an exclusion application before the Hon'ble NCLT seeking exclusion of the intervening period from the last date of extended CIRP period i.e., 14.06.2025 till the disposal of the extension application;

RESOLVED FURTHER THAT pursuant to Section 12 (3) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 read with regulation 40 of Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (Insolvency Resolution Process for Corporate Persons) Regulations, 2016, the COC be and hereby approved the extension of CIRP period for a period of sixty (60) days from the date of order of Hon'ble NCLT extending the CIRP;

RESOLVED FURTHER THAT, Mr. Jalesh Kumar Grover, Resolution Professional is hereby authorized to move appropriate applications under Section 12(3) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, and other applicable provisions, before the Hon'ble NCLT, New Delhi Bench, seeking exclusion of the intervening period from the last date of extended CIRP period i.e., 14.06.2025 till

the disposal of the extension application and further extension period of sixty (60) days from the date of order.”

Further, the Chairman invited the Homebuyers, who were attending the meeting virtually, to share their queries one by one. A brief record of the discussions held with the Homebuyers is as mentioned below:

The AR raised a query stating that, three meetings has been attended by her in the capacity of AR, and as per Regulation 16A of Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, attendance for two meetings stands automatically ratified. Further, the AR requested that this agenda shall also be placed for voting. The RP clarified that the same shall be part of the CIRP Expenses Ratification Agenda.

S. No.	Homebuyer Queries	Responses
1.	One of the homebuyers raised a query stating that a physical meeting was held 2–3 days ago with the RP and the SRA, and that the said meeting now appears to have been dispensed with and no action is proposed to be taken pursuant to it. The homebuyer sought clarification regarding the reason for the same.	The RP clarified that the meeting was not dispensed with but was duly conducted. During the meeting, it was proposed that a committee would be constituted to compare the plans of Samyak and Krish, as requested by some HBs. However, this is no longer required at present, as the resolution plan of Krish has been sent back by the Hon’ble NCLT. The RP stated that once the revised plan or addendum is received, discussions on revised proposal will be undertaken. If all challenges are addressed satisfactorily, a comparison shall be prepared with the earlier resolution plan of Krish and the same shall be presented to the committee.
	It was further queried that, as discussed in the earlier meeting, Krish had been informed that efforts would be made to bring their proposal at par with	The RP clarified that since the Hon’ble NCLT has reminded back the plan and all objections raised in respect of the plan are now required to be addressed by the SRA.

	<p>Samyak's plan. Clarification was sought as to whether this process would still continue.</p>	<p>Once the SRA incorporates the necessary corrections, the RP will examine whether all challenges and objections have been duly resolved.</p>
2.	<p>One of the homebuyers asked, is there any timeline for the Krish to submit the revised proposal?</p> <p>A query was raised as to whether, if the SRA does not submit the revised proposal within one week, there is a possibility that the hearing scheduled for 28.11.2025 may get delayed.</p>	<p>The RP clarified that Krish has been requested to submit the revised proposal within one week. The RP further informed that an extension of 60 days will be required, for which the CoC's approval will be sought in the present meeting. Upon approval, an application for extension will be filed before the Hon'ble NCLT. The intention is to have the application listed on 28.11.2025.</p> <p>The RP clarified that the hearing on 28.11.2025 is already fixed and is independent of the submission of the revised Resolution Plan. He further clarified that the hearing scheduled for 28.11.2025 pertains to other matters and will not be affected by the SRA's timeline for submitting the revised proposal.</p>
3.	<p>One of the homebuyers sought update on the retrofitting.</p>	<p>The RP clarified that the report on retrofitting has already been received, along with the estimated expenses. RP further informed that the retrofitting work will commence once fit out work/construction activity at the site begins.</p>

	<p>A query was raised as to whether any penalty has been imposed on the previous security agency.</p> <p>A query was raised regarding the consequences in the event Samyak repeats a similar incident with the newly appointed security agency. Then any action against Security agency will be taken?</p> <p>Is bouncers of Samyak from the site has been removed?</p>	<p>The RP responded that the earlier security agency has already been replaced. It was further clarified that no penalty can be imposed on the previous agency, as apparently, there was no fault on the part of security guards.</p> <p>The RP replied that the newly appointed security agency is more competent compared to the earlier one. It was further stated that every security agency functions in accordance with its own operational capacity and protocols. The RP expressed his view that no such incident is expected to be repeated by Samyak in this regard.</p> <p>The RP clarified that there are no bouncers at the site; however, three security guards have been deployed by Samyak Projects Private Limited.</p>
4.	<p>A query was raised regarding whether the internal retrofitting work can be commenced at the site.</p>	<p>The RP clarified that the Hon'ble NCLT has remanded the Resolution Plan back to the CoC and the only matters presently pending before the NCLT are the applications filed by or against Samyak, to ensure that Samyak does not cause any disruption at the site.</p> <p>The RP further informed that internal retrofitting work cannot commence at this stage, as the inventory process is still underway. Once the inventory is completed, the next step will be preparation of the</p>

		budget. In the meantime, the RP is making efforts to obtain order from the Hon'ble NCLT.
5.	<p>One of the homebuyers raised a query as to whether, since the plan has been remanded back, it can now be compared with other plans, and whether the other Resolution Applicants would be involved in this process.</p> <p>The homebuyers sought update on another project of Krish.</p>	<p>The RP clarified that since the plan has been remanded back by the Hon'ble NCLT, it has been remanded solely for the purpose of addressing and rectifying the objections raised. No fresh or additional process can be initiated.</p> <p>The RP stated that a brief note on the other projects of Krish will be presented. He further informed that the relevant details will be obtained from Krish to ensure that there is no inconsistency in the information provided.</p>
6.	<p>A request was made to initiate a settlement with Samyak, being the landowner, prior to the submission of the revised Resolution Plan, so that the issue does not continue to linger any further.</p> <p>It was suggested that any liability arising in this regard should be expressly stated to be the sole responsibility of the SRA.</p>	The RP stated that the matter has already been communicated to the SRA, and discussions in this regard are ongoing.
7.	Whether Homebuyers who have paid less than 35% of the consideration, and to whom no legal notice has been issued by Ansal, are eligible to submit their claims?	The RP clarified that, although several judgments exist on this issue, the legal position is not yet conclusively settled. Further, reference was made to a published legal article which states that the

		Information Memorandum, prepared by the RP shall include the details of all allottees, including their names, amounts due, and units allotted, as reflected in the corporate debtor's records, irrespective of whether such allottees have filed claims; and the resolution plan shall provide for treatment of such allottees.
8.	<p>Tower-wise fit out work was previously underway. Kindly clarify the current status of the construction in this regard.</p> <p>A request was made by the Homebuyers to the Resolution Applicant to consider initiating construction of the towers that have not yet commenced, Parallelly with the ongoing towers, so that the overall progress of the project may be expedited.</p>	<p>The RP stated that the construction activities have been temporarily put on hold. The matter will be reconsidered once the Modified Resolution Plan is received.</p> <p>The RP replied that, as a matter of practical approach, the Resolution Applicant is expected to prioritize completion of the towers where construction has already commenced. However, the Resolution Applicant has, proposed in the previous plan that Homebuyers of non-constructed towers may switch their units in the towers that are nearing completion or have been completed. The request of the HBs shall be duly conveyed to the SRA.</p>
9.	<p>The Hon'ble NCLT has observed that all transactions pertaining to non-claimants are required to be verified, as this responsibility lies with both the Resolution Applicant and the Resolution Professional. In this regard, kindly clarify the criteria and</p>	<p>RP replied that all data pertaining to belated claimants and non-claimants will be forwarded to the SRA, with directions to appropriately address these categories in the Modified Resolution Plan.</p>

	<p>parameters that will be applied for such verification.</p> <p>Kindly clarify the matters, which will be taken up on the next date of hearing scheduled for 28.11.2025. Additionally, please confirm whether the application relating to the Resolution Plan may also be heard on that date.</p>	<p>The RP clarified that the Resolution Plan will not be taken up for hearing on that date. The application against Samyak, along with other pending applications, is scheduled to be heard on 28.11.2025.</p> <p>Further, the application seeking extension of CIRP Period to be filed before NCLT may also be heard on that day.</p>
10.	<p>A request has been placed that the payments made by Homebuyers in excess of 100% of the sale consideration be duly adjusted towards the advance amount payable at the time of registration, and that the same be expressly incorporated in the Modified Resolution Plan.</p>	<p>The RP acknowledged the request and noted the same for appropriate consideration.</p>
11.	<p>During the last physical meeting, discussions were held on the formation of a committee. What was the primary objective of constituting this committee? Was it to review both the plans in detail and to prepare a comparative assessment to facilitate informed decision-making?</p>	<p>The RP clarified that in view of the plan having been remanded back, the intention is to resolve and remove all objections raised in respect of the plan. Therefore, if deemed necessary, a committee shall be formed after the hearing scheduled on 28.11.2025, subject to legal view, in this regard.</p> <p>Thereafter, AR Ms. Akriti, aligning with the RP's submission, stated that the meeting under reference was conducted before 17.11.2025, the date on which the hearing was held. Consequently, at that stage, neither the RP nor the AR was in a position to compare the plans. AR added that, given</p>

		the changed circumstances and the remand back of the plan, a comparative discussion on previous proposal & revised proposal may now be undertaken.
12.	One of the homebuyers raised query regarding whether the remand back of the plan implies that a completely new plan is required to be submitted, or whether filing an addendum to the existing plan would suffice.	The RP clarified that, it is upon the SRA to decide whether a fresh plan is to be submitted or an addendum would suffice. The RP further stated that, for the time being, we can only wait for their revised proposal.
13.	<p>Further, a question was raised as to whether the plans submitted by other applicants can also be assessed and examined.</p> <p>One of the homebuyers raised a query regarding the appropriate steps to be taken in the event the plan under consideration is deemed unsuitable or not in the best interest of the stakeholders.</p>	<p>The RP responded that the plans submitted by others cannot be taken into consideration unless a fresh Form G is issued.</p> <p>The RP clarified that the appropriate course of action can be determined only after the revised proposal is submitted. Once the same is received, it will be reviewed and deliberated upon.</p>
14.	In view of the information that the Hon'ble NCLT has remanded the plan back for the purpose of considering all objects, a request was made to clarify and elaborate on the objections or issues identified by the Hon'ble Bench.	The RP clarified that the primary objections relate to late claims, escalation concerns, and one other application wherein the applicant (Homebuyer) seeking directions to consider his claim as allottee and admit the claim as financial creditor in class, as his claim has been admitted as unsecured financial creditor.

	<p>In view of the Hon'ble NCLT's direction to rectify all discrepancies, a query was raised regarding whether the said direction is beneficial or adverse in the present circumstances.</p> <p>One of the homebuyers raised a query regarding the proposal of the plan, as the RP earlier stated that, at the time the plan was earlier put to vote, he had informed the CoC about several discrepancies and concerns within the plan. However, notwithstanding those observations, the plan was ultimately approved by the CoC.</p>	<p>The RP clarified that since the Resolution professional is the officer of Court means appointed by the Hon'ble NCLT. Therefore, the RP, is bound to comply with its directions and cannot take any position in opposition to the Tribunal' orders. Nonetheless, he noted that the SRA or the CoC are at liberty to challenge the said decision, if they consider it necessary.</p> <p>AR Ms. Aakriti Sood additionally stated that the right of each homebuyer is to receive their flat remains intact, irrespective of whether their claims were submitted belatedly. AR further highlighted that the recent changes and clarifications in the legal position have a bearing on such matters, and accordingly, the Hon'ble NCLT has remanded the plan with the objective of rectifying and addressing these issues comprehensively.</p> <p>The RP clarified that the plan was legally compliant. The concerns raised have already been taken on record, and the RP assured that all issues pertaining to the homebuyers, as well as the Samyak matter, will be duly addressed in the revised proposal to facilitate the speedy approval of the plan. The RP further stated that if any aspect remains unaddressed in the plan, the same will be placed before the CoC in its meeting.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>In continuation of Ms. Aakriti's statement that the Hon'ble NCLT has merely remanded the plan and has not directed the issuance of Form G for inviting any fresh plans, a question was put forth on whether the RP is empowered to propose that the Resolution Plan be reworked with zero escalation charges.</p>	<p>The RP reiterated that the revised plan shall first be placed in the CoC. If it is observed that the plan is not feasible or does not meet the required parameters, further deliberations may be undertaken to explore other available courses of action. He emphasized that the CoC has full authority to evaluate and decide upon all possible alternatives.</p>
15.	<p>In light of the Hon'ble NCLT's decision to remand back the CoC approved Resolution Plan, clarification was sought on the precise objections identified by the Bench. A specific query was also raised as to whether any remark, observation, or objection relating to Samyak formed part of the issues pointed out by the Hon'ble Tribunal.</p>	<p>The RP clarified that the Hon'ble NCLT has stated that all the objections to the resolution plan, by the homebuyers' be dismissed. He further stated that the application pertaining to Samyak has not yet been decided and remains pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal.</p>
16.	<p>One of the homebuyers raised a query as to whether the SRA had attended the meeting or if any communication had been issued to them in this regard.</p> <p>One of the homebuyers raised query as to whether the Hon'ble NCLT has specifically directed or indicated that</p>	<p>The RP clarified that the SRA does not participate in CoC meetings as they are not members of the Committee. The RP added that the counsel of the SRA was present before the Hon'ble NCLT during the hearing, and, having agreed with the observations of the Bench, the plan was thereafter remitted for necessary action.</p> <p>The RP replied that the Hon'ble Bench had observed that several objections had been raised in respect of the plan and asked what</p>

	escalation charges are not to be imposed.	solution the SRA was proposing. In response, the counsel for the SRA stated that they would endeavour to address and remove all objections, if the plan is remanded back.
17.	One of the homebuyers raised a query regarding the next scheduled date for submission of the revised plan.	The RP clarified that no specific date has been fixed for submission of the plan. He further stated that an extension will first be sought, following which appropriate timelines may be determined.
18.	<p>Reference was made to the RP's earlier statement that, in the event the Hon'ble NCLT directs the admission of belated claims, the SRA may opt to challenge the order. Accordingly, clarification was sought on whether the RP has followed up with the SRA on this potential course of action.</p> <p>One of the homebuyers raised query regarding the purpose of the hearing listed for 28.11.2025, and whether substantive arguments are expected to be heard on that date.</p>	<p>The RP explained that the plan was remanded back by the Hon'ble NCLT with the consent of the SRA, and therefore, in light of their concurrence before the Bench, the SRA does not have the scope to file an appeal against the said order.</p> <p>The RP clarified that the primary purpose of the hearing on 28.11.2025 is to address the application moved against Samyak, wherein a request has been made to restrain them from undertaking construction activities.</p>
19.	One of the homebuyers raised query regarding who will address and resolve the issues concerning Samyak, and whether this responsibility lies with the SRA or with the homebuyers.	The RP explained that the responsibility of resolving the Samyak-related issues rests with the SRA, and the same is expected to be incorporated and settled within the revised proposal. Once the revised proposal is received, the RP will evaluate the situation and decide whether any further intervention is required.

20.	<p>A query was raised as to whether it is required to deploy gunmen at the project site for safety or compliance purposes.</p> <p>We came across a statement that, in real estate insolvency cases, no homebuyer has been able to obtain possession of their house. We would like to confirm whether this is correct.</p>	<p>The RP explained that ensuring the security of the property forms part of his statutory responsibilities. Accordingly, the deployment of gunmen at the project site has been made to ensure adequate protection of the site.</p> <p>The RP clarified that they are presently handling several other real estate matters, and in four of such cases, the homebuyers have already received possession of their residential units.</p>
21.	<p>It was requested that the Resolution Professional consider facilitating a deliberation between the homebuyer group, both those in favour of and those opposed to the claims pertaining to Samyak, with a view to achieving an amicable and mutually acceptable resolution of the matter.</p>	<p>The RP clarified that once the revised proposal is received, it will be examined, and thereafter the appropriate further steps required from the RP's end will be taken accordingly.</p>
22.	<p>Can we explore other means?</p>	<p>The RP explained that the plan of SRA has been remanded back for reconsideration of COC, in accordance with judicial precedents. It is advisable that the COC first look at the plan and then discuss further.</p>
23.	<p>Whether a meeting with Samyak can be convened for further clarity and discussion on the issues involved?</p>	<p>The RP clarified that the Homebuyers' Committee, which was formed earlier, may meet with Samyak for the purpose of negotiation. However, Samyak cannot be formally invited or allowed to participate in the CoC meeting.</p>

Thereafter, the AR raised a query as to whether Section 29A due diligence is required to be undertaken again, considering that the Resolution Plan had been approved through e-voting on 12.06.2024 and more than an year has elapsed since then. The RP clarified that needful shall be done, in this regard.

The Committee took note of the same.

VOTE OF THANKS

There being no other business to transact, the matter was concluded at 03:00 PM with the vote of thanks, by the chairman to all the participants for their effective participations.



(Jalesh Kumar Grover)

Resolution Professional

In the Matter of M/s Ansal Properties and Infrastructure Limited (Project Fernhill)

Regn. No. IBBI/PA-001/IP-P00200/2017-2018/10390

(AFA valid till 31-12-2025)

**Registered Address: S.C.O No 818, 2nd Floor, N.A.C,
Manimajra, Chandigarh-160101**

Email for [Correspondence -cirp.fernhill@gmail.com](mailto:Correspondence-cirp.fernhill@gmail.com)

Email regd. with IBBI – jk.grover27@gmail.com

Mobile- +91-7717303525, +91-92160-01808

Date: 21.11.2025

Place: Chandigarh