

Material Litigations and Regulatory Actions

Brief details of material litigations and regulatory actions as at the year ended March 31, 2021

As required under Clause 13 of Schedule III of the REIT Regulations, this note discloses (i) all pending title litigation and title related irregularities pertaining to the Portfolio and (ii) details of all pending criminal matters, regulatory actions and civil/commercial matters against Mindspace REIT, the Sponsors, the Manager or any of their Associates, the Sponsor Group and the Trustee (collectively, “**Relevant Parties**”). Only such pending civil/commercial matters against the Relevant Parties have been disclosed where amount involved are in excess of the materiality thresholds disclosed below. In addition to the above, other pending civil/commercial proceedings by the Asset SPVs and Sponsor Group (excluding the Sponsors) which are considered material by the Manager, have been disclosed.

Further, all pending direct tax, indirect tax and property tax matters against the Relevant Parties have been disclosed in a combined manner.

Based on various relevant considerations, including the statutory filings with the relevant registrar of companies and legal and accounting advice received, it has been determined that control across KRC group entities is exercised only collectively (jointly, and not severally) by all the shareholders / interest-holders belonging to the KRC group, of the respective entity. However, solely for the purposes of disclosure herein, details of all LLPs/companies of the KRC group, where the Sponsor(s) is/are shareholder(s)/interest holder(s) (which, however, are controlled collectively and jointly by all KRC group shareholders/interest holders in such LLPs/companies) have been considered. Therefore, solely for the purpose of disclosures herein and no other purpose, including, applicable law relating to such other purpose, all pending criminal matters, regulatory actions and civil/commercial matters against these entities where amount involved are in excess of the materiality thresholds set out herein have been disclosed. Further, all pending direct tax, indirect tax and property tax matters against these entities have been disclosed in a combined manner.

All disclosures are as of March 31, 2021.

I. MATERIAL LITIGATION AND REGULATORY ACTIONS PENDING INVOLVING MINDSPACE REIT AND THE ASSET SPVS

As of March 31, 2021, Mindspace REIT does not have any pending criminal matters or regulatory actions against it, or any material civil/commercial litigation pending involving it.

For the purpose of pending civil/commercial litigation against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs, such matters where value exceeds 1% of the consolidated profit after tax of Mindspace REIT as of March 31, 2021 have been considered material and proceedings where the amount is not determinable but the proceeding is

considered material by the Manager from the perspective of Mindspace REIT, have been disclosed. In addition to the above, pending civil/commercial proceedings by Mindspace REIT or the Asset SPVs which are considered material by the Manager have been disclosed.

A. Avacado (i) Title litigation and irregularities

1. Nusli N. Wadia (“**Plaintiff**”) filed a suit (“**Suit**”) before the Bombay High Court (“**High Court**”) against Ivory Properties, Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, Inorbit Malls, Avacado and others (“**Defendants**”) pertaining to inter alia revocation of the registered agreements for sale of certain buildings, including the registered agreements executed in favour of Avacado for acquiring buildings viz. Paradigm constructed on demarcated portion of the land located at Mindspace Malad project, and demolishing of the building Paradigm located at Mindspace Malad project. The Plaintiff’s claim with regard to Avacado is restricted to its transaction relating to Paradigm building constructed on the demarcated portion of land located at Mindspace Malad project and does not extend to the equity shares of Avacado or any other assets held by Avacado.

The Suit was filed inter alia alleging certain insufficient payment to the Plaintiff, breach and non-adherence of the project agreement of 1995 entered into between the Plaintiff and Ivory Properties in respect of certain land situated at Malad West and Kanheri, including the demarcated portion of the land on which building Paradigm is constructed in Mindspace Malad project (“**1995 Agreement**”), and pertaining to sale of certain buildings inter alia on ground of sale of such buildings to alleged related parties. The Plaintiff sought inter alia (i) orders of declarations and permanent injunctions relating to the termination of the 1995 Agreement, (ii) the termination of some of the registered agreements and memorandums of understanding entered between the Plaintiff, Ivory Properties and purchasers in respect of some of the buildings constructed on the demarcated portions of land in Malad (including the building viz. Paradigm located at Mindspace Malad project), (iii) demolishing of such buildings and (iv) damages from Ivory Properties, Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja and Mr. Chandru L. Raheja to the extent of ₹ 3,509.98 million along with interest. A notice of motion was also filed by the Plaintiff seeking interim and ad-interim reliefs for inter alia appointment of receiver for buildings sold by the Plaintiff and Ivory Properties to various Defendants (including Avacado), restraining Ivory Properties and other Defendants (including Avacado) from alienating, encumbering or parting with possession of the building and restraining Ivory Properties and other Defendants (including Avacado) from dealing with (including renewal of leases / licenses) or creating fresh leases / licenses in respect of the buildings, and from receiving or recovering any sum in respect thereof by way of rent, license fee or

compensation for occupation, or if received or recovered be directed to deposit the said rent, license fee or compensation to the High Court. No ad-interim relief was granted to the Plaintiff.

The Defendants filed replies inter alia stating that the Suit is barred by limitation and that the transactions under the registered documents are genuine and in accordance with the 1995 Agreement and that the Plaintiff had deliberately made false and defamatory comments to cause damage to the reputation of the Defendants inter alia to pressurize Ivory Properties and its directors into meeting the Plaintiff's demands for unjustifiable amounts beyond what is payable under the 1995 Agreement. Further, Ivory Properties has also filed a counter-claim for various reliefs relating to specific performance of the 1995 Agreement and refund of ₹ 16 million with interest paid to the Plaintiff, and in the alternative for payment of estimated damages of ₹ 6,091.40 million inter alia towards loss of profit from the balance development potential and ₹ 5,000 million along with interest for compensation towards defamation.

The High Court, by its orders dated September 19, 2013 and September 20, 2013, framed the issue of limitation under section 9A of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908, as a preliminary issue of jurisdiction and directed the Plaintiff to file affidavit of evidence. Aggrieved, the Plaintiff challenged the orders of the High Court by filing a special leave petition ("SLP") in the Supreme Court of India. The Supreme Court of India, by an order dated October 8, 2013, stayed further proceedings with regards to the Suit filed in the High Court, till further orders. Thereafter, the Supreme Court of India, by its order dated August 25, 2015, referred the SLP to a three-judge bench. Subsequently, the Supreme Court of India disposed of the SLP by an order dated December 12, 2018 as infructuous in view of deletion of Section 9A of Civil Procedure Code by the Maharashtra Act 61 of 2018 with liberty to apply in case the need arises.

The Plaintiff filed an application before the Supreme Court of India to restore the original SLP by cancelling the order dated December 12, 2018 in view of further amendment the Code of Civil Procedure (Maharashtra Amendment) Act, 2018. By its judgment dated October 4, 2019, it was held by the three judge bench of Supreme Court of India that Section 9A of Civil Procedure Code by the Maharashtra Act 61 of 2018 cannot be decided as a preliminary issue as to jurisdiction. The Supreme Court of India has directed for the matters to be placed before the appropriate bench for consideration on merits. The notice of motion for interim relief and the Suit are pending for the final hearing before the High Court.

Separately, in relation to a transaction of divestment by the KRC group of their shareholding in respect of one of its group company, the Plaintiff, through his advocates & solicitors, had addressed certain letters, including to KRCPL, CCI and the merchant bankers acting in that transaction. The Plaintiff had also issued caution public notice dated October 1, 2016, cautioning the public about the risks and consequences in dealing with the suit property. The allegations and averments have been responded by KRCPL and the merchant bankers and the transaction of divestment was completed.

Further, the Plaintiff, through his advocates, addressed a letter dated February 13, 2020, including to Mindspace REIT, the Manager, the Trustee, the Sponsors, Avacado, Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, Ivory Properties and KRCPL, expressing his objection to the proposed Offer and any actions concerning the building at Paradigm Mindspace Malad. The allegations and averments made by the Plaintiff have been responded by parties concerned. No further correspondence has been received.

(ii) Criminal matters

There are no pending criminal matters against Avacado.

(iii) Regulatory actions

1. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Avacado, Gigaplex, Intime, KRIT, MBPPL, Sundew, Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, Chalet Hotels, Genext, Inorbit Malls, KRCPL, Stargaze, Shoppers Stop and others ("Parties"). Pursuant to the Warrant, the Income Tax Department carried out a search on November 30, 2017. The search covered various matters for which notices were already issued from time to time. The search was concluded on December 6, 2017 at the office and residence of the Parties. Pursuant to the search, the Income Tax Department issued notices to each of the Parties under Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, directing them to prepare and furnish true and correct returns of total income for assessment years from 2012-13 to 2017-18 within a stipulated timeline from the date of service of the notices and these returns have been furnished before the Income Tax Department. Further, the Income Tax Department issued notices under Section 142(1)/143(2) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment years 2012-13 to 2017-2018/2018-19, to the Parties seeking certain information. These details have been furnished before the Income Tax Department by the Parties from time to time.

Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Avacado received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for the assessment years of block assessment period (ranging from assessment years 2012-2013 to 2017-2018) and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act 1961 for assessment years 2018-19, for an aggregate demand of ₹ 43.74 million. Avacado filed rectification applications and appeals which are pending before the relevant authority. Certain rectification applications have been processed by the relevant authority granting an aggregate refund of ₹ 99.78 million.

2. MPCB allegedly issued a show cause notice dated November 11, 2016 ("First SCN") to Avacado for alleged failure in obtaining no objection/ permission from the CGWA for extraction of ground water in respect of the Paradigm Mindspace project. MPCB served a show cause notice dated March 14, 2017 on Avacado, referring to the First SCN stating that the First SCN was issued pursuant to the directions given to MPCB and CGWB by the National Green Tribunal judgement dated January 11, 2016 and November 8, 2016 (in the matter of Asim Sarode V/s District Collector, Nanded and others, where Avacado was not a party) to jointly

prepare a list of industries and infrastructure projects which require permission for extracting ground water and to issue directions for closure of such industries and infrastructure projects for whom the default persists. By letter dated April 6, 2017, Avacado responded to MPCB inter alia stating that (a) there is no requirement for Avacado to apply for or obtain NOC from CGWA, as Avacado does not appear in the list of industries and infrastructure projects which require permission for extracting ground water as published on the MPCB website; (b) Avacado does not withdraw ground water at the Paradigm Mindspace Malad project; and (c) the First SCN was not received by Avacado. No further correspondence has been received.

3. The Office of Tehsildar, Borivali ("**Tehsildar**") issued demand notices dated February 5, 2021 and dated March 2, 2021 under provisions of Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966 to Ivory Properties and others for retrospective payment of non-agricultural tax ("**NA Tax**") of ₹ 52.63 million. The demand notices were issued pursuant to the letter dated February, 5, 2021 of the Collector (Mumbai Suburban Office) ("**Collector**"), wherein it was recorded that all urban lands in state being used for non-agriculture purpose, NA Tax assessment had been stayed for the period August 1, 2006 to July 31, 2011 till the revised guidelines were finalized as per government letter NAP0311/CR28/L5 dated August 24, 2011 and that as per Government of Maharashtra decision dated February 5, 2018, the stay was lifted. Ivory Properties vide letter dated March 30, 2021 has denied the quantification and leviability of the NA Tax assessment with retrospective effect and has requested the Tehsildar not to take any coercive action, without giving a reasonable opportunity to file a reply. Ivory Properties also tendered, without prejudice, an 'on account' deposit of a sum of ₹ 3.00 million to the Office of Tehsildar, without admitting or accepting any liability.

(iv) Material civil/commercial litigation

There are no other material civil/commercial litigation involving Avacado.

B. Gigaplex

(i) Title litigation and irregularities

1. Baburam Ramkishan Yadav ("**Baburam**"), president of Universal Education Society ("**UES**"), filed a suit and injunction application before the Court of Civil Judge (J.D.) Vashi at C.B.D. ("**Civil Court Vashi**") seeking injunction restraining Gigaplex from encroaching upon land admeasuring approximately 500 square meters on which a school is operated by UES ("**Suit Property**"), which is in the Mindspace Airoli West admeasuring approximately 202,300 square meters ("**Larger Land**").

Gigaplex denied the claims stating that inter alia Gigaplex was a lessee of MIDC in respect of the Larger Land, and that Baburam has illegally encroached upon about 250 square meters on the eastern boundary of the Larger Land. By its order dated August 20, 2018, the Civil Court rejected the injunction application ("**Order**"). Baburam has challenged the Order before the Court of District Judge Thane. The suit and appeal filed by Baburam are currently pending before the relevant courts.

Gigaplex filed a suit against UES and MIDC before the Court of Civil Judge (Senior Division) Thane at Thane ("**Civil Court Thane**"), inter alia for possession of 569.80 square metres or such area as may be found in unauthorized occupation of UES, damages of ₹ 10.80 million, mesne profits of ₹ 0.30 million per month till the recovery of possession and injunction to restrain from further trespassing on the land at Mindspace Airoli West. Subsequently, Gigaplex also filed an injunction application before the Civil Court Thane seeking, inter alia, a temporary injunction to restrain Universal Education Society, its trustees, office bearers etc. from trespassing and encroaching the Suit Property and the adjacent plot of land leased by MIDC to Gigaplex. In an interim application for injunction filed by Gigaplex, a status quo order was passed on July 26, 2019 by the Civil Court Thane. The status quo was continued by the Civil Court Thane till the final decision in the matter, through its order dated March 5, 2020, disposing of the injunction application. The suit is currently pending before the Civil Court Thane.

Baburam also filed a complaint before Rabale police station, Navi Mumbai, against a security guard in charge of Gigaplex for allegedly threatening him and damaging of a display board at the Suit Property. Baburam also issued a letter addressing the Commissioner of Navi Mumbai, the Police Commissioner of Navi Mumbai, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra and others, for harassment by security personnel of Gigaplex in the Suit Property. No action has been taken against Gigaplex in this regard.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. The Joint Director of Industries, Government of Maharashtra ("**JDI**") had issued a letter of intent dated July 26, 2007 ("**LOI**") to B. Raheja Builders Private Limited (now, Gigaplex Estate Private Limited) for establishing and registering an IT software unit for 'Software Development'. Subsequent to the letter from JDI, MIDC, by its letter dated June 30, 2009, intimated Gigaplex to register as an IT Park, being a private developer. Thereafter, the JDI, by its letter dated May 16, 2016 ("**JDI Letter**"), sought clarification from Gigaplex in relation to non-registration of the IT software unit within the stipulated timeline and sought to initiate action against Gigaplex under the IT/ITES policy. Gigaplex was in the process of completing the endorsement of the lease deed dated November 1, 2007 executed with MIDC in relation to the Mindspace Airoli West project, for payment of stamp duty, which remained with the relevant revenue authorities for endorsement, for submission to JDI. The lease deed was endorsed by the revenue authorities on September 11, 2019. By its letter dated October 9, 2019 to the JDI, Gigaplex has responded to the JDI Letter inter alia stating that (a) the land was granted by MIDC under lease deed dated November 1, 2007 for proposed I.T. software unit (Software Development), but due to recession and other reasons, the erstwhile management of B. Raheja Builders Pvt. Ltd. decided to pursue development as private IT Park (instead of software development) with due approval of the Director Industry, IT, pursuant to the NOC issued by MIDC; (b) accordingly, Gigaplex has developed the land as private IT Park; and (c) Gigaplex also voluntarily approached the stamp authorities and paid the full stamp duty and registration fees in relation to the lease deed, and (d) the development of private IT Park was undertaken

with due approval of Director of Industry (IT), Maharashtra and no benefit was received by it under the IT/ITES policy. No further correspondence has been received.

2. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Gigaplex and others. For details, see "Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions". Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Gigaplex received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for the assessment years of block assessment period (ranging from assessment years 2012-2013 to 2017-2018) for an aggregate demand of ₹ Nil. Gigaplex has filed rectification applications and appeals which are pending before the relevant authority. Certain rectification applications have been processed by the relevant authority granting an aggregate refund of ₹ 29.56 million. The assessment proceeding for the assessment year 2018-2019 is ongoing.
3. Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited ("MSEDCL") filed a petition dated October 16, 2018 against Maharashtra State Load Despatch Centre, wherein electricity distribution companies in Maharashtra including, MBPPL and Gigaplex (which hold electricity distribution licenses) and others, were impleaded as parties, before Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission ("MERC") seeking payment of alleged past dues, removal of anomalies and directions regarding over-drawal of electricity. Through its final common order dated September 26, 2019, MERC partly allowed MSEDCL's prayer against which MSEDCL and one of the electricity distributions companies have filed separate appeals before the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity ("APTEL"). Pursuant to an order dated December 18, 2019, the APTEL instructed that notices be issued to respondents in the appeal, including Gigaplex and MBPPL. By an order dated September 15, 2020, interim applications for condonation of delay in filing the appeals were allowed. The appeals are pending before the APTEL.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

There are no other material civil / commercial litigation involving Gigaplex.

C. Horizonview

(i) Title litigation and irregularities

1. An enquiry notice was issued by District Revenue Officer, Thiruvallur ("DRO") and Additional District Judge to W.S. Industries (India) Limited ("WSIIL"), an erstwhile owner of a land parcel admeasuring approximately 46.04 acres ("Suit Land") of which a portion admeasuring approximately 6.16 acres was acquired by RPIL. RPIL has granted development rights to Horizonview over such land in relation to the Commerzone Porur project. Horizonview is not a party to the proceedings.

The DRO issued an enquiry notice dated May 25, 2017 ("Notice") to WSIIL calling for an enquiry to be conducted before the District Revenue Officer cum Additional District Judge at the District Collector Office on the basis of a complaint presented by P. Jeyapal S/o R. Perumalsamy ("Jeyapal") alleging that land have been handed over

to WSIIL on certain conditions, and instead of using the land for common purpose, WSIIL has been using the land for commercial purpose. Aggrieved, WSIIL has filed a writ petition before the Madras High Court against the DRO and Jeyapal, seeking directions for quashing the Notice. The Madras High Court, by its order dated June 5, 2017, has granted interim stay on proceedings under the Notice. The matter is currently pending before the Madras High Court.

2. Based on legal advice received, the following documents granting development rights in favor of Horizonview for the purposes of constructing an IT Park, have not been registered:
 - a. The development agreement, dated November 7, 2006, executed by RPIL, the owner of the land and Horizonview ("Development Agreement");
 - b. The award dated March 22, 2016, passed by the arbitrator in relation to disputes between RPIL and Horizonview in relation to the Development Agreement ("Award");
 - c. The letter dated May 18, 2017 executed between RPIL and Horizonview; and
 - d. The written arrangement dated February 20, 2019, executed by RPIL and Horizonview modifying the terms of the Development Agreement and the Award.

(i) Criminal matters

There are no pending criminal matters against Horizonview.

(ii) Regulatory actions

There are no other pending regulatory actions against Horizonview.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

There are no material civil/commercial litigation involving Horizonview.

D. Intime

(i) Litigation

There are no litigations in relation to the land held by Intime.

(ii) Criminal matters

There are no pending criminal matters against Intime.

(iii) Regulatory actions

1. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Intime and others. For details, see "Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions". Intime has received notice dated November 27, 2019 under Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, to file its income tax return for assessment year 2008-09 within seven days from the date of service of notice and the return has been filed with the Income Tax Department and the assessment proceeding is ongoing. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Intime received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for the assessment years of block assessment period (ranging from assessment years 2012-2013 to 2017-2018) and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for the assessment year 2018-

2019 for an aggregate refund of ₹ 226.18 million. Intime has filed rectification applications which are pending before the relevant authority.

2. Intime had completed construction of its building 5B in Mindspace Madhapur project (“**Building**”) without obtaining Environment Clearance (“**EC**”) on account of lack of clarity at the relevant time with respect to classification of the relevant area forming part of Intime. Intime has filed a sou-moto application dated September 9, 2017 (“**EC Application**”) under a regularization scheme notified by MoEF vide notification dated March 14, 2017 for cases relating to construction without the requisite environment clearance for regularization of the Building. The aforesaid application was considered as a case of violation and the State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority (“**SEIAA**”) issued ‘Standard Terms of Reference’ issued by the MoEF, along with certain ‘Specific Terms of Reference’ (“**TOR**”) which included, among others, obligation on the state government/ state pollution control board to take action against the project proponent under the provisions of section 19 of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986. As per the terms of the TOR, the Telangana State Pollution Control Board (“**TSPCB**”) issued letter dated December 16, 2020 (“**Letter**”) to Environment Engineer (“**EE**”), with a copy to Intime, directing EE to ensure immediate stoppage of construction work and to enquire and take necessary action on alleged violation of the EIA Notification, 2006 against Intime under the provisions of the Environment Protection Act, 1986. Accordingly, the EE filed complaint in the Court of the Hon’ble IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Cyberabad at Kukatpally (“**MM Court**”) against Intime under the Environment Protection Act, 1986 read with Criminal procedure Code (“**Cr. PC**”) for the offence under the Environment Protection Act, 1986. The MM Court found Intime punishable for offence of Environment Protection Act, 1986 and accordingly imposed a payment of ₹ 25,000 for the offense. Intime has made payment of a sum of ₹ 25,000 to the MM Court. SEIAA considered the above matter of Intime in its meeting and has approved the issuance of EC subject to submission of bank guarantee of ₹ 3.39 million by Intime for implementation of certain remedial and augmentation plans, along with detailed action plan for implementation. Intime has submitted letter to the Member Secretary SEIAA, requesting to share bank guarantee format along with details of beneficiary for submission of bank guarantee.
3. For other pending regulatory actions against Intime, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – KRIT– Regulatory actions”.

(iv) Material civil/commercial litigation

There are no material civil/commercial litigation involving Intime.

E. KRIT

(i) Title litigation and irregularities

1. Softsol India Limited (“**Softsol**”) and others (“**Petitioners**”) have filed writ petition on February 8, 2013 in the Hyderabad High Court (“**Court**”) against KRIT (wrongly named as M/s. K Raheja Corporation) and others (“**Respondents**”) inter alia seeking declaration (a) that the allotment of land admeasuring approximately 4,500 square yards

(3,763 square metres) (“**Suit Land**”) of land adjacent to Softsol’s plot is illegal and (b) for handover of the same to the Industrial Area Local Authority (“**IALA**”), being one of the Respondents, for developing the Suit Land as a common facility centre / area / park for general use by software companies. The Suit Land is part of the land admeasuring approximately 110 acres allotted by the Government of Andhra Pradesh to KRIT for the Mindspace Madhapur project.

By an ex-parte interim stay order dated February 11, 2013 (“**Stay Order**”), it was inter alia directed by the Court that, no construction activity shall be undertaken or continued over the triangular piece of 2 acres 40 cents of land earlier identified at the time of allotment as ‘Common Facility Centre’ in the software layout. IALA and APIIC have filed affidavits opposing the writ petition, confirming the allotment and rights of KRIT in the Suit Land, and for vacating the Stay Order. The matter is pending before the Court.

Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation (“**GHMC**”) had filed an application in the Court for clarification that the Stay Order does not preclude GHMC from acquiring a portion of 0.14 acres (approximately 567 square meters) for road widening. Subsequently, GHMC has acquired the portion of land and constructed the road.

(ii) Criminal matters

1. Sharmin Habib (“**Complainant**”) lodged a first information report (“**FIR**”) on October 10, 2017 with the Madhapur Police Station alleging that certain staff members of the Raheja Group (“**Accused**”) prevented the Complainant and a staff from entering the premises for conducting the business of a day care centre in the name of Kidz Paradise in Building No. 2.B, Mindspace Madhapur (KRIT), and harassed them. The concerned investigating officer has filed final report dated November 16, 2017 of the matter before the Metropolitan Magistrate, Kukatpally at Miyapur, Cyberabad (“**Court**”), stating inter alia that while there was a rental dispute between the Complainant and the Accused which was pending in the Court, the particular incident was in relation to a regular security aspect of access in the IT Park being allowed on showing identity card, whereas Complaint tried to enter without showing identity card. The investigating officer also reported that the Complainant did not comply with the notices under Section 91 of the Criminal Procedure Code, and that no such incident had occurred as alleged by the Complainant. The investigating officer further recorded that the complaint was filed on completely flimsy grounds and filed the final report before the Court recommending closure of the case on basis of lack of evidence. The matter is currently pending.

(iii) Regulatory actions

1. The Comptroller and Auditor General of India (“**CAG**”) had issued a report on public sector undertakings for the year ended March 2016 (“**CAG Report**”) where certain audit observations were made with respect to certain public sector undertakings including: (a) a low rate of return on investments made by APIIC (now, TSIIC) in KRIT; (b) allocation of the development and construction of complexes for IT and ITES companies to K. Raheja Corporation Private Limited by the erstwhile Government

of Andhra Pradesh (“GoAP”) without adopting a due tender process; (c) transfer of certain portion of land to non-IT/ITES sister companies of the KRC group, namely, Trion Properties Limited – Inorbit Malls and Chalet Hotels–Westin Hotel at a discounted price, in violation of GoAP directions dated August 11, 2003 and without prior consultation with APIIC, pursuant to the demerger of KRIT. KRIT responded to the observations under the CAG report by its letter dated September 21, 2017 submitting its issue-wise detailed explanations and explaining various factual inaccuracies in respect of the said observations under the CAG Report, denying the irregularities and deficiencies. No further correspondence has been received.

2. KRIT had proposed a rights issue of shares in which Andhra Pradesh Industrial Infrastructure Corporation (“APIIC”) (now, TSIIC) abstained from subscribing to the rights shares. Consequently, upon closure of the rights issue subscription by the other shareholders of KRC group, the stake of APIIC in KRIT reduced from 11%. Thereafter, upon demerger of certain undertakings of KRIT into Intime and Sundew, the APIIC’s stake reduced in each of these entities instead of what it was initially at 11%. Such rights issue of shares was undertaken in compliance with applicable law and agreement between the parties, and after KRIT had waited over one year for APIIC to decide.

Subsequently, APIIC / GoAP disputed such dilution of their stake in KRIT, Intime and Sundew, which led to an inquiry by Vigilance and Enforcement Department of GoAP against the Government Officials and correspondingly, KRIT. APIIC issued a letter dated July 10, 2012 to KRIT, referring to a report of vigilance and enforcement department (“VED Report”) in relation to the Mindspace Madhapur project. Subsequently, the equity stake of APIIC was restored to 11% in KRIT, Intime and Sundew together with compensating APIIC for any loss of corporate benefits in the intervening period. The VED Report alleged certain irregularities, which include alleging a financial loss to APIIC and GoAP pursuant to sale of the land to its sister concerns and sale of constructed area, at a nominal price, dilution of 11% equity stake of APIIC and loss of immovable asset base to APIIC due to the dilution of equity.

KRIT denied such irregularities, violations or financial loss caused to APIIC /GoAP. While denying the loss alleged by APIIC, KRIT, Intime and Sundew provided a joint undertaking dated February 14, 2014 to APIIC inter alia undertaking (i) to pay the amounts to APIIC in respect of APIIC’s claim of losses, due to any differences in values pertaining to the sale transactions in Mindspace Madhapur project; (ii) that payments shall be made by KRIT within 30 days of receipt of such written demand from APIIC; and (iii) that KRIT shall be bound by the decision of APIIC and comply with the same within the stipulated timelines.

KRIT has further provided an undertaking dated October 24, 2016 to APIIC, inter alia undertaking to pay losses incurred by Government of Telangana /APIIC as per the VED Report and to maintain the agreed shareholding of the Government of Telangana or APIIC in KRIT, Intime and Sundew post conversion of KRIT to public limited company and the Government of Telangana/ APIIC will not be required to infuse additional funds to maintain its equity stake in KRIT, Intime and Sundew.

While KRIT has attempted to make payments to the extent of the loss incurred by APIIC along with interest, by letter dated April 23, 2019, APIIC has confirmed to KRIT that it will be informed about the quantum of the amount to be paid, once the quantum of loss is determined by an independent third party appointed for such purpose. KRCPL, by way of its letter dated December 9, 2019, has undertaken that it shall assume any financial liability that KRIT, Intime or Sundew may incur in this behalf.

3. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against KRIT and others. For details, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions”. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, KRIT received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for the assessment years of block assessment period (ranging from assessment years 2012-2013 to 2017-2018) and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment year 2018-2019, for an aggregate demand of ₹ 1,655.54 million. KRIT has filed rectification applications and appeals which are pending before the relevant authority.
4. KRIT had completed construction of its building 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B and 10 in Mindspace Madhapur project (collectively “Buildings”) without obtaining Environment Clearances (“ECs”) on account of lack of clarity at the relevant time with respect to classification of the relevant area forming part of the KRIT. KRIT has filed four suo-moto applications dated September 7, 2017 and one suo moto application dated September 9, 2017 (“EC Applications”) under a regularization scheme notified by MoEF vide notification dated March 14, 2017 for cases relating to construction without the requisite environment clearance for regularization of the Buildings. The aforesaid applications were considered as cases of violation and the State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority (“SEIAA”) issued ‘Standard Terms of Reference’ issued by the MoEF, along with certain ‘Specific Terms of Reference’ (“TORs”) which included, among others, obligation on the state government/ state pollution control board to take action against the project proponent under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986. As per the terms of the TORs, the Telangana State Pollution Control Board (“TSPCB”) issued five letters, each dated December 16, 2020 (“Letters”) to Environment Engineer (“EE”), with a copy to KRIT, directing EE to ensure immediate stoppage of construction work and to enquire and take necessary action on alleged violation of the EIA Notification, 2006 against KRIT under the provisions of the Environment Protection Act, 1986. Accordingly, the EE filed 5 complaints in the Court of the Hon’ble IX Metropolitan Magistrate, Cyberabad at Kukatpally (“MM Court”) against KRIT under the Environment Protection Act, 1986 read with the Criminal procedure Code (“Cr. PC”) for the offence under the Environment Protection Act, 1986. The MM Court found KRIT punishable for offense under the Environment Protection Act, 1986 and accordingly imposed a payment of ₹ 25,000 for each offense. KRIT has made the requisite payment to the MM Court. SEIAA considered the above matters of KRIT in its meeting and has approved the issuance of ECs subject to submission of bank guarantee by KRIT of: (i) ₹ 3.95 million for Building

1A and 1B; (ii) ₹ 10.14 million for Building 2A and 2B; (iii) ₹ 4.41 million for Building 3A and 3B; (iv) ₹ 5.20 million for Building 4A and 4B; and (v) ₹ 5.44 million for Building 10 for implementation of certain remedial and augmentation plans, along with detailed action plan for implementation. KRIT has submitted letter to the Member Secretary SEIAA, requesting to share bank guarantee format along with details of beneficiary for submission of bank guarantees.

(iv) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. KRIT filed an arbitration application on September 21, 2015 before the Hyderabad High Court (“**High Court**”) against Premier Kinder Care Services Private Limited (“**Premier**”). KRIT prayed for appointment of sole arbitrator to resolve disputes between KRIT and Premier in relation to (a) the term sheet dated March 10, 2011 entered into between KRIT and Premier for grant of lease by the KRIT to Premier in respect of Unit No. 2 admeasuring 3171 sq. ft. in Building No.2B at Mindspace Madhapur (KRIT) (“**Premises**”); (b) failure of Premier in making payments of ₹ 11.42 million due on account arrears of rent, balance security deposit together with interest thereon and (c) to deliver the possession of the Premises to KRIT. The notice of the petition has been served on Premier by publication in newspapers, pursuant to the order of the High Court dated November 25, 2016. The High Court by its order dated March 11, 2020 allowed the application for appointment of sole arbitrator. The arbitrator was appointed. The matter is currently pending.

F. KRC Infra

(i) Title litigation and irregularities

1. Ashok Phulchand Bhandari has instituted a civil suit against Balasaheb Laxman Shivle and 29 others (“**Defendants**”) alleging rights over a portion of land admeasuring approximately 0 hectares 44.15 ares (1.09 acres) (“**Suit Land**”), on which Gera Commerzone Kharadi is situated. KRC Infra is not a party to the suit and further, no summons from the Court have been received by KRC Infra till date. Gera Developments Private Limited, the original purchaser of the Gera Commerzone Kharadi land has also not been joined as a party to the suit.

A Special Civil Suit no. 2102 of 2010 is filed by Ashok Phulchand Bhandari against the Defendants before the Civil Judge, Senior Division, Pune (“**2010 Suit**”) with respect to the Suit Land seeking inter alia declaration, specific performance against the Defendants and a decree of permanent injunction restraining the Defendants from causing any construction or development on the Suit Land. Ashok Phulchand Bhandari has also challenged inter alia (a) the decree dated September 26, 2008 passed by the Civil Judge, Senior Division, Pune, wherein the suit filed in 2005 by Tanhubai Amruta Pathare, (wife of late Amruta Tukaram Pathare, being one of the erstwhile co-owners of a portion of the Suit Land), through her legal heirs, against Popat Amruta Pathare, one of the Defendants (“**2005 Suit**”), was withdrawn on the basis of a compromise pursuis arrived at between the parties to the 2005 Suit and one of the Defendants; (b) registered partition deed / Vatanipatra dated September 15, 1993 pursuant to which Amruta Tukaram Pathare became entitled to a portion of land forming part of the Gera Commerzone land; and (c) will and testament dated January 19, 1995 executed

by late Amruta Tukaram Pathare. Further, in view of the 2010 Suit, a notice of lis pendens dated April 10, 2015 was separately filed and registered by Ashok Phulchand Bhandari. The matter is currently pending.

2. The heirs of Balu Laxman Shivle have issued a notice to Gera Developments Private Limited in relation to claim over land admeasuring approximately 0 hectares 80.30 ares (1.98 acres) (“**Disputed Land**”), on which Gera Commerzone Kharadi is situated. No such notice has been received by KRC Infra.

By a notice dated July 16, 2016 (“**Notice**”), the heirs of Balu Laxman Shivle viz. (a) Shobha Balu Shivle, (b) Hrishikesh Balu Shivle, (c) Om Balu Shivle, claimed their share in an area in the Disputed Land, being the share of late Amruta Pathare (“**Land Owner**”). It was also alleged that the registered sale deed dated February 12, 1996 executed in favor of Gera Developments Private Limited was executed without the signatures and consent of the wife and daughter of the Land Owner and that they did not receive any consideration on account of sale of the Disputed Land. By letters dated August 20, 2016 and January 23, 2017, Gera Developments Private Limited has replied to the Notice denying all allegations. No further correspondence has been received.

3. Rahul Bhausahab Pathare, one of the legal heirs of an erstwhile owner of a portion of land forming part of the Gera Commerzone Kharadi land, through his legal counsel, (“**Claimant**”) has issued a notice dated December 14, 2019 (“**Notice**”) to Gera Developments Private Limited, KRC Infra and others alleging claim over an undivided portion of two lands parcels admeasuring approximately 0 hectares 40 ares (0.98 acres) and 1 hectare 68.6 ares (4.16 acres), respectively, (“**Disputed Lands**”), on which Gera Commerzone Kharadi is situated.

The Claimant has alleged inter alia that (a) the Disputed Lands were the undivided property of the Hindu Undivided Family of Pathare family (“**Pathare HUF**”), and his consent / confirmation was not obtained for sale of the same in favour of Gera Developments Private Limited in the year 1996; (b) since the Claimant was a major at the time of execution of the sale deeds executed in the year 1996 in favour of Gera Developments Private Limited, his signature should have been obtained as a coparcener since, in the absence of any reason for sale of the Disputed Lands for the benefit of the Pathare HUF, the Karta of the joint family, Bhausahab Kaluram Pathare (father of the Claimant), could not have executed the sale deeds on behalf of the joint family; (c) Gera Developments Private Limited has, through forgery, fraudulently added hand-written clauses, regarding right of way, to the sale deeds executed in its favor after the execution thereof; and (d) that the subsequent transactions in respect of the Disputed Lands, including inter alia sale of portions thereof in favor of KRC Infra, its mortgage by KRC Infra, leasing of buildings / premises constructed thereon in favor of various lessees, are illegal and not binding upon the Claimant, to the extent of his share in the Disputed Lands.

The Claimant has also sought to take legal action against the addressees (including KRC Infra) in the event (a) any

further agreements / arrangements are entered into in respect of the Disputed Lands, and (b) of failure to revoke and cancel the deeds, documents and agreements executed inter se the addressees (including KRC Infra) to the extent of the Claimant's share in the Disputed Lands. KRC Infra, through its legal counsel, has by its letter dated December 24, 2019 sent an interim reply to the Notice inter alia denying the allegations made by the Claimant. KRC Infra, through its legal counsel, has by its letter dated June 29, 2020 sent a response to the Claimant stating inter alia that in absence of supporting documents received from the Claimant in support of his claim pursuant to the interim reply, the Notice stands withdrawn and his claim does not survive. No further correspondence has been received.

(ii) Criminal matters

There are no pending criminal matters against KRC Infra.

(iii) Regulatory actions

1. A notice dated July 25, 2019 was issued by PMC to KRC Infra and Gera Developments Private Limited ("**GERA**") alleging non-compliance with certain provisions of the approval of reservation shifting dated October 3, 2016 issued by the PMC in relation to a cultural centre, parking and hospital area at Gera Commerzone Kharadi on the basis of a complaint received by PMC. GERA and KRC Infra have replied to the notice, by way of a letter dated August 14, 2019, refuting all allegations. The matter is currently pending.

(iv) Material civil/commercial litigation

There are no other pending material civil / commercial litigation involving KRC Infra.

G. MBPPL

(i) Title litigation and irregularities

1. Shrimant Chhatrapati Udayan Raje Pratapsinh Maharaj Bhonsale ("**Plaintiff**") has filed a suit before the Civil Judge Senior Division Pune ("**Civil Court**") against Shri Mukund Bhavan Trust ("**MBT**"), its trustees, and the State of Maharashtra ("**Defendants**") for declaration of title and possession of lands in Yerwada, Pune admeasuring approximately 322.7 acres ("**Suit Land**"); including approximately 25 acres 27 gunthas (approximately 1,03,940 square meters) ("**Commerzone Land**") of land in which units (approximate 1.68 msf of leasable area as per lease deeds) in Commerzone Yerwada, one of our Portfolio, are situated. MBT, as the owner of 79.32 acres land ("**MBT Land**"), had executed a registered development agreement in 2004 with KRCPL with respect to the Commerzone Land. Commerzone Yerwada land, which includes the rights in demarcated portions of the Commerzone Land, was transferred from KRCPL to MBPPL pursuant to the scheme of arrangement sanctioned on September 7, 2017). Neither KRCPL nor MBPPL is joined as a defendant to the suit.

The Plaintiff is seeking, inter alia declarations and injunctions in his favour in relation to ownership and possession of the Suit Land and to set aside compromise decrees passed in (i) 1953 in Suit No. 152/1951; (ii) 1990 in Suit No. 1622/1988; and (iii) 2003 in Civil Appeal No. 787/2001; all in proceedings between MBT and the State of Maharashtra.

The Plaintiff also filed an application for temporary injunction which is pending. No interim or ad-interim relief has been granted to the Plaintiff. MBT applied to the Civil Court for rejection of the plaint filed by the Plaintiff on the grounds of limitation, which was rejected by order dated April 29, 2014. MBT filed revision petition against the said rejection order, in the Bombay High Court, which was dismissed on April 26, 2016. MBT filed SLP No.18977 of 2016 against the said dismissal order, which is pending before the Supreme Court of India.

The Plaintiff filed an application on March 9, 2015 in the Civil Court for amendment to the prayers in the suit, inter alia to limit the Plaintiff's claim for possession only with regard to vacant land in possession of the Defendants and lands alienated subsequent to the filing of the suit, and to seek compensation from MBT with regard to constructed units and alienated part of the Suit Land instead of seeking possession of the developed portion for which registered deed with regard to alienation were executed prior to the filing of the suit in 2009. The application for amendment of the plaint was rejected by the Civil Court by its order dated November 14, 2016. Aggrieved, the Plaintiff filed Writ Petition No. 4268/2017 in the Bombay High Court challenging the said order dated November 14, 2016, which is currently pending before the Bombay High Court.

Two applications made by third parties, being M/s. Mahanagar Developers and M/s. Mahanagar Constructions for being joined as party defendants in the suit, were granted on November 14, 2016 by Civil Court. The Plaintiff challenged this order by filing Writ Petition No. 4415/2017 in the Bombay High Court. By a common order dated February 15, 2018 passed in the aforesaid two writ petitions (Nos. 4268/2017 and 4415/2017), the Bombay High Court requested the trial judge not to proceed in considering any interim application, till the adjourned date of hearing of these petitions. These matters are currently pending before the Bombay High Court.

The Plaintiff registered a notice of lis-pendens dated July 7, 2011 in respect of the Suit No.133/ 2009 and applied for mutation in the revenue records. Purshottam M. Lohia, a trustee of MBT and Panchashil Tech Park Private Limited (an entity claiming certain rights in survey No.191A Yerwada village) ("**Panchashil**") opposed the mutation, which opposition was rejected. Panchashil filed appeal before the District Superintendent of Land Records and relied on the government notification dated September 21, 2017 directing revenue authorities to remove or cancel all mutations entries in respect of notice of lis-pendens ("**Notification**").

2. Ravindra Laxman Barhate filed complaint and revenue proceedings against Shri Mukund Bhavan Trust ("**MBT**") and others in relation to the allotment and exemption order under the Urban Land Ceiling Act, 1976 in respect of the MBT Land (as mentioned in para 1 above).

A complaint was filed on November 27, 2015 by Ravindra Laxman Barhate with the Divisional Collector Pune and other authorities, against MBT and others (together, "**Respondents**") alleging tampering, cheating as also breach of terms and conditions by the Respondents inter alia with respect to order dated November 24, 2003

passed under Section 20(1) of the Urban Land Ceiling Act, 1976 in respect of the MBT Land at Yerwada, Pune (“**ULC Order**”) and seeking action against the Respondents and cancellation of the ULC Order.

MBT filed a writ petition before the Bombay High Court, for quashing any enquiry / investigation on the basis of the said complaint filed by Ravindra Laxman Barhate. By order dated March 5, 2018, the Bombay High Court has restrained the Additional Collector from passing any order on this complaint until the next hearing date. Through its order dated January 6, 2020, the Bombay High Court inter alia restrained the State of Maharashtra and certain other respondents from passing any order pursuant to the complaint filed on November 27, 2015 until disposal of the writ petition. The matter is currently pending.

Ravindra Laxman Barhate also filed a Revenue Appeal No.1826/2015 before the Revenue Minister, State of Maharashtra (“**Revenue Minister**”) against the Commissioner & Collector, Pune and MBT, challenging a report dated June 20, 2011 of the Divisional Commissioner, Pune (“**Report**”) wherein MBT was stated to be the owner of the MBT Land (which include the demarcated portions of the land pertaining to Commerzone Yerwada); inter alia to set aside the Report, pass an order directing the relevant authorities to submit a new inquiry report and restrain the purchase-sale, construction on the disputed land. By way of order dated September 23, 2015, the Revenue Minister ordered that status quo be maintained as regards the record of the suit property.

MBT had filed a writ petition challenging the order dated September 23, 2015 passed by the Revenue Minister. Since the State Government of Maharashtra withdrew the said order dated September 23, 2015, stating that the pending proceedings will be heard by the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, the said writ petition was disposed of by order dated October 28, 2015 as not surviving while keeping open all contentions of both the parties on merits. MBT challenged the said Order dated October 28, 2015 in the Supreme Court of India (“**Court**”) inter alia on the ground of maintainability of such proceedings before the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department. By order dated January 21, 2016, the Supreme Court of India has stayed the proceedings pending before the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department. The matter is currently pending before the Court.

3. The Office of the Land Reforms Tribunal & Revenue Divisional Officer, Hyderabad (“**Tribunal**”) had by its letter dated August 11, 2009, sought certain information from Serene Properties Private Limited (now MBPPL) under Section 8(2) of the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agriculture Holdings) Act, 1973 (“**APLRAC**”) in respect of the land at Mindspace Pocharam.

Serene has filed a reply on September 30, 2009. The authorized officer has filed a counter and Serene has filed a rejoinder dated August 29, 2012. Serene has stated that the land transferred in favor of MBPPL was notified for industrial use and has been declared as an SEZ and is not “land” covered under the APLRAC. The proceedings are pending before the Special Grade Deputy Collector and Revenue Divisional Officer, Ranga Reddy District. In

September 2012, MBPPL also submitted to the Tribunal a copy of the order dated August 9, 2012, which was passed by the Hon’ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh (“**High Court**”) in a similar matter (being Writ Petition No. 19300/2012 filed by Neogen Properties Pvt. Ltd.) wherein a stay was granted by the High Court until further orders. The matter is currently pending before the Tribunal.

4. A letter dated February 4, 2019 from the Office of Executive Engineer, BDD Zone No.4 was forwarded by an architect firm to MBPPL on February 11, 2019 wherein PMC sought clarifications regarding certain objections pertaining to the land at Commerzone Yerwada, regarding payment of ₹ 156.98 million consisting of ₹ 56.34 million principal of recoverable amount and ₹ 100.64 million on account of interest. MBPPL by way of its letter dated February 28, 2019 replied to PMC inter alia stating that the letter has been addressed to the incorrect recipient who is not a developer of the relevant portion of the land, and sought clarifications with respect to the contents of the letter and disputed the payment demand. Further, by way of its letter dated July 2, 2019, MBPPL requested for a reply to its letter dated February 28, 2019 and stated that it would be ready to pay amounts, if any payable, if and once the clarifications sought by it are provided.

(ii) Criminal matters

There are no pending criminal matters against MBPPL.

(iii) Regulatory actions

1. Deputy Assessor and Collector (Indira Docks), Mumbai issued demand notice dated June 7, 2012 for payment of ₹ 0.4 million towards octroi for import of certain goods at Commerzone Yerwada project. MBPPL replied by way of its letters dated March 2, 2017, March 14, 2017 and March 22, 2017 stating, inter alia that it has made payments for the aforesaid goods. MBPPL received another demand notice dated March 21, 2018 in relation to the aforesaid payment of octroi. MBPPL replied by way of letter dated April 18, 2018 and reiterated that there is no liability to pay octroi in this case. No further correspondence has been received.
2. MBPPL has received several demand notices from the stamp duty and revenue authorities in relation to alleged deficit payment of stamp duty aggregating to ₹ 10.18 million along with penalty in certain instances with respect to certain leave and license agreements / lease deed entered into by MBPPL, in its capacity as licensor/ lessor. MBPPL has from time to time responded to such demand notices inter alia stating that the liability for stamp duty on the documents was that of the respective licensee / lessees.
3. Ministry of Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation, Central Ground Water Board issued a show cause notice dated March 22, 2019 to MBPPL for non-compliance and contravention of the mandatory conditions of the NOC issued of ground water extraction for Commerzone Yerwada project and directed MBPPL to rectify the non-compliances. MBPPL has replied by way of its letter dated April 12, 2019 stating that it has initiated all actions required for compliance with the no-objection certificate and requesting withdrawal of the show cause notice dated March 22, 2019. No further correspondence has been received.

4. MPCB, pursuant to the meeting of its Consent Appraisal Committee (“CAC”) held on December 12, 2017, issued a show cause notice dated June 5, 2018 to Trion Properties Pvt. Ltd. (prior to demerger of mall and IT undertakings from Trion Properties Pvt. Ltd. to MBPPL) in relation to certain non-compliances with environmental clearance for one commercial building (approximately 0.56 msf of leasable area as per lease deeds) forming part of The Square, Nagar Road project, and directed MBPPL to stop work on the project until a valid consent is obtained from it.

Earlier, Trion Properties Pvt. Ltd. had obtained environment clearance on May 8, 2007 and consent to operate dated September 30, 2011 which was renewed from time to time. In the renewal of consent to operate application dated August 27, 2013, MPCB had specified the requirement for applying separately for environment clearance and consent to operate for additional construction area. By application dated March 17, 2017 Trion Properties applied for renewal of consent to establish for IT building and for correction of built-up area of the mall building.

By letter dated March 20, 2018, MBPPL (as the successor of Trion) referred to the observations requested the MPCB to grant the consent to establish and replied to the alleged non-compliances observed by the MPCB. MBPPL replied to the show cause notice by way of its letter dated July 6, 2018 stating that it had received amended environment clearance dated June 15, 2018 and complied with the other requirements and requested for withdrawal of the show cause notice and grant of renewed consent. Further, on August 18, 2018, the CAC requested for certain details for considering MBPPL’s consent to establish application. MBPPL provided the requested details to the CAC on September 4, 2018. CAC in its meeting held on December 11, 2018 observed that MBPPL had applied for re-validation for consent to establish for remaining BUA for IT activity, and was operating IT activity without obtaining consent from MPCB, and deferred the case and requested MBPPL to provide a presentation along with the relevant documents. On January 19, 2019, CAC requested MBPPL to contact the concerned person for taking prior appointment of the chairman for the presentation.

MBPPL has made an application dated December 11, 2019 to MPCB to obtain consent to operate, for the IT building at The Square, Nagar Road. CAC issued a show cause notice dated August 17, 2020 as to why the application for consent to operate should not be refused, inter alia as environment clearance was not in the name of the project and sought clarity and details inter alia relating to occupation certificate. By reply dated August 24, 2020, MBPPL provided the required clarifications and details, and requested for processing the application and issuing the necessary consent to operate. The CAC, in its meeting held on December 4, 2020, has approved to grant the consent to operate subject to MBPPL submitting the amended environmental clearance in the name of MBPPL and after payment of additional consent fees.

5. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against MBPPL and others. For details, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado

– Regulatory Actions”. MBPPL, Genext, KRCPL, Ravi C. Raheja, Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja and Magna (now merged with Chalet Hotels) received a notice dated November 27, 2018 from the Income Tax Department in relation to certain transactions entered into by certain KRC group persons, including MBPPL. The aggregate amount involved in these transactions was ₹ 13,303.16 million. The Income Tax Department has sought an explanation as to why the relevant portion of the amount mentioned above should not be added to the income of the respective companies for the relevant assessment year during assessment years 2012-13 to 2017-18, being the block period of assessment. The aforementioned companies/ individuals have responded to the Income Tax Department through letters dated January 14, 2019 refuting the claims of the Income Tax Department. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, MBPPL received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for the assessment years of block assessment period (ranging from assessment years 2012-2013 to 2017-2018), for an aggregate demand of ₹ 12.94 million. MBPPL filed rectification applications and appeals which are pending before the relevant authority. Certain rectification applications have been processed by the relevant authority granting an aggregate refund of ₹ 387.28 million. The assessment proceeding for the assessment year 2018-2019 is ongoing.

6. The Collector of Stamps (Enforcement), Mumbai issued an interim demand letter dated December 18, 2017 and rectification order dated December 20, 2017 for deficit stamp duty aggregating to ₹ 333.28 million. By way of letter dated December 26, 2017, MBPPL expressed its disagreement with respect to determination of the amount of stamp duty for the demerger of certain undertakings of Trion Properties Pvt. Ltd. into MBPPL and stated that it will effect the payment of the disputed amount under protest and requested that the original order of the NCLT be returned to MBPPL duly endorsed, to enable MBPPL to make the payment and register the same. The amount of ₹ 333.28 million was paid under protest on December 27, 2017. No further correspondence has been received.
7. For other pending regulatory actions against MBPPL, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Gigaplex – Regulatory actions”.

(iv) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. With respect to the termination of a license agreement between MBPPL and Capstone Securities Analysis Private Limited (“Capstone”), a licensee at Unit No.003 in Building No.1 in Commerzone Yerwada, MBPPL has filed an eviction suit against Capstone in the Small Causes Court at Pune (“Court”) for payment of arrears of license fees and other charges aggregating to ₹ 10.80 million and has sought injunction. The matter is currently pending.

H. Sundew

(i) Title litigation and irregularities

1. The Office of the Land Reforms Tribunal Cum Deputy Collector & Special Grade Revenue Divisional Officer, Attapur (“Tribunal”) had, by letter dated August 27, 2009, sought information from Sundew under Section 8(2) of the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agriculture

Holdings) Act, 1973 (“**APLRAC**”) in respect of the entire land parcel at Mindspace Madhapur (Sundew).

The Revenue Department of the Government of Andhra Pradesh forwarded a Memo dated September 5, 2009 for furnishing of certain information to the Government of Andhra Pradesh, including information requested by the aforesaid letter dated August 27, 2009. Sundew has filed a detailed response on September 30, 2009 stating that (a) the land was originally granted by the Government of Andhra Pradesh to KRIT which was a joint venture company with APIIC, (b) the land was vested in Sundew by way of demerger order of the Andhra Pradesh High Court, (c) the land has been declared as an SEZ and is therefore exempt from the local laws; (d) the land was shown as a non-agricultural land in the master plan of Hyderabad and is therefore not “land” covered under the APLRAC. The Tribunal issued a final notice to Sundew in January 2012 requesting Sundew to submit a declaration for full and correct particulars of the lands held by Sundew. In September 2009, Sundew also submitted a copy of the order dated August 9, 2012, which was passed by the Hon’ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh (“**High Court**”) in a similar matter (being Writ Petition No. 19300/2012 filed by Neogen Properties Pvt. Ltd.) wherein a stay was granted by the High Court until further orders. The matter is currently pending before the Tribunal.

(ii) Criminal Matters

There are no pending criminal matters against Sundew.

(iii) Regulatory actions

1. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Sundew and others. For details, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions”. Sundew has received notice dated November 27, 2019 under Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, to file its income tax return for assessment year 2008-09 within seven days from the date of service of notice and the return has been filed with the Income Tax Department and the assessment proceeding is ongoing. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Sundew received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for the assessment years of block assessment period (ranging from assessment years 2012-2013 to 2017-2018) and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for the assessment year 2018-2019 for an aggregate refund of ₹ 384.93 million. Sundew has filed rectification applications which are pending before the relevant authority. Certain rectification applications have been processed by the relevant authority increasing the aggregate refund to ₹ 405.03 million.
2. For other pending regulatory actions against Sundew, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – KRIT–Regulatory actions”.

(iv) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. Sundew filed an application before the then Andhra Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission (now Telangana State Electricity Regulatory Commission

(“**TSERC**”) on March 10, 2014 requesting TSERC to take on record the ‘deemed distribution licensee’ status of Sundew for the development, operation and maintenance of SEZ at Madhapur, Hyderabad. TSERC passed an order dated February 15, 2016 (“**TSERC Order**”) identifying Sundew as a deemed distribution licensee for a period of 25 years with effect from April 1, 2016 subject to inter alia Sundew obtaining capital infusion from its promoters before March 31, 2016. Sundew filed an application dated March 16, 2016 (“**Interlocutory Application**”) before TSERC seeking modification of condition in respect of equity infusion and extension of time to comply with the same. TSERC passed an order dated August 4, 2016 directing compliance with TSERC Order and denying extension of time and also directed the existing licensee to continue the power supply till September 30, 2016. TSERC, by its letter dated September 22, 2016, has granted extension of time to continue power supply till the state transmission utility grants network connectivity and open access. Aggrieved, Sundew filed a petition (“**Review Petition**”) before TSERC on August 26, 2016, seeking inter alia review of the order dated August 4, 2016. Additionally, Sundew also filed an appeal to the Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (“**APTEL**”) challenging the TSERC Order and in relation to the conditions imposed by TSERC which was dismissed on September 27, 2019. The matter is currently pending before the TSERC with respect to the review petition filed by Sundew. Aggrieved by the order dated September 27, 2019, Sundew has also filed a civil appeal on November 15, 2019 before the Supreme Court of India. By an order dated February 22, 2021 passed in the civil appeal, the Supreme Court of India directed TSERC to hear the pending applications/ petitions filed by Sundew before TSERC, to list the matter for final hearing and granted liberty to the parties to file their written note of arguments. The matter is pending before the Supreme Court of India and TSERC.

In addition to the above pending proceedings, Gigaplex and KRC Infra have been identified as parties in two separate labour proceedings filed in the year 2019 by certain trade unions before the labour courts and industrial courts/tribunals in Mumbai alleging unfair labour practices under the Maharashtra Recognition of Trade Unions and Prevention of Unfair Labour Practices Act, 1971 against certain workmen engaged by them. The matter is currently pending before the relevant courts/tribunals.

II. MATERIAL LITIGATION AND REGULATORY ACTIONS PENDING AGAINST THE SPONSORS

As of March 31, 2021, the Sponsors do not have any pending criminal matters or regulatory actions against them, or material civil/ commercial litigation pending against them.

For the purpose of pending civil/ commercial litigation against the Sponsors, such matters where value exceeds 5% of the total revenue of each of the Sponsors, whichever is lower, as of March 31, 2021 as per their respective financial statements have been considered material and proceedings where the amount is not determinable but the proceeding is considered material by the Manager have been considered.

III. MATERIAL LITIGATION AND REGULATORY ACTIONS PENDING INVOLVING THE SPONSOR GROUP

With respect to the Sponsor Group (excluding the Sponsors), details of all pending criminal matters and regulatory actions against the Sponsor Group (excluding the Sponsors) and material civil/commercial litigation pending against the Sponsor Group (excluding the Sponsors) have been disclosed.

For the purpose of pending civil/ commercial litigation against the Sponsor Group (excluding the Sponsors), such matters where value exceeds 1% of the consolidated profit after tax of Mindspace REIT as of March 31, 2021 have been considered material and proceedings where the amount is not determinable but the proceeding is considered material by the Manager have been disclosed. In addition to the above, pending civil/ commercial proceedings by the Sponsor Group (excluding the Sponsors) which are considered material by the Manager have been disclosed.

A. Mr. Ravi C. Raheja

(i) Criminal matters

1. Nusli N. Wadia ("**Complainant**") lodged a first information report ("**FIR**") against Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja and Mr. Chandru L. Raheja ("**Accused**"), inter alia alleging criminal breach of trust, cheating and misappropriating his funds, causing alleged losses aggregating to ₹ 40 million, arising out of one of the transactions in respect of the building constructed on a demarcated a portion of the lands situated at Malad West, Mumbai pursuant to an agreement entered into between the Complainant and Ivory Properties in 1995. Pursuant to the FIR, the Economic Offences Wing, Mumbai filed a charge sheet before the Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Esplanade Mumbai ("**Court**"). Thereafter, the Accused have been released on bail bond pursuant to the order dated October 18, 2013 by the Additional Sessions Judge. The Accused have filed an application dated September 28, 2018 for discharge of charges. In an intervention application filed by the Complainant on January 16, 2019, the Court, by its order dated September 26, 2019, allowed the Complainant to assist the prosecution by filing written arguments and submission in the discharge application filed by the Accused. The Complainant has filed a writ petition in the Bombay High Court to squash the order dated September 26, 2019 rejecting the Petitioner's application to make oral submissions in the discharge application. The matter is currently pending before the Court. All three Accused have filed separate criminal revision application together with miscellaneous application for condonation of delay in the Sessions Court, Mumbai, challenging the Court's order dated September 26, 2019, allowing the Complainant to assist the prosecution by filing written arguments and submission in the discharge application filed by the Accused. The Sessions Court, Mumbai, has issued notice in the miscellaneous applications filed by the Accused.
2. The Metropolitan Magistrate, Vile Parle West, Mumbai ("**Magistrate**") issued summons dated September 11, 2018 to Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja and another, to appear before the Magistrate in relation to two different complaints. The

summons relates to an alleged violation of signage license conditions by the Hypercity store at Goregaon West, Mumbai, in contravention of the provisions of the Bombay Municipal Corporation Act, 1888. Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja and another filed a petition before the Bombay High Court for quashing the summons issued by the Magistrate. The Bombay High Court, through an order dated October 29, 2018, has barred the Magistrate from taking any coercive action against Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja and another till date of the next hearing. The matter is currently pending before the Magistrate.

- (ii) The Office of the District Superintendent of Police, Ahmedabad Rural, Special Investigation Team (Land) ("**SIT**") has issued a notice dated December 8, 2020 ("**First Notice**") to Mr. Ravi C. Raheja and Mr. Neel C. Raheja for seeking written explanation and to remain present personally with all documents relating to certain land in the village Sachana, Viramgam ("**Land No.1**") in connection with the application (complaint) made by Casme Industrial Park Development Pvt. Ltd. ("**Casme**") and Mr. Harit Bhupendrabhai Patel ("**HP**"). SIT has further issued five notices each dated December 27, 2020 to Sentinel Properties Private Limited ("**Sentinel**") and its directors, including Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja for seeking written explanation and to remain present personally with all documents relating to Land No.1 and certain land parcels in village Sachana, Viramgam within three days from receipt of the aforesaid five notices in connection with the applications (complaints) made by Casme, HP, Bharat Ratilal Delivala, Vijay Ratilal Delivala, Dipak Ratilal Delivala and Priti Ajay Delivala alleging fraud in land transaction. Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja are erstwhile directors of Sentinel and were on its board of directors till August 2012. K. Raheja Corporate Services Private Limited has by its reply dated January 4, 2021 submitted written explanation along with copies of documents as required on behalf of Sentinel and its directors. K. Raheja Corporate Services Private Limited has by its second reply dated January 18, 2021 submitted further written explanation along with copies of documents as required on behalf of Sentinel and its erstwhile directors. The Directorate of Enforcement had requested for attendance of the erstwhile directors of Sentinel in connection with an investigation under the provision of Money Laundering Act, 2002, and later a summons dated November 12, 2020 was also received by one of the erstwhile directors in this regard. Detailed information and documents had been provided by K Raheja Corporate Services Private Limited to the Directorate of Enforcement by letter dated November 9, 2020 and November 19, 2020. Subsequently, by another summons dated January 15, 2021 received on January 20, 2021, the Directorate of Enforcement requested attendance of one of the erstwhile director of Sentinel on January 25, 2021 to tender a statement. By letter dated January 23, 2021, K Raheja Corporate Services Private Limited on behalf of Sentinel informed the Directorate of Enforcement that the said erstwhile director of Sentinel was unable to attend their office due to illness and requested for a further date in this regard. The said erstwhile director of Sentinel remained present before the Directorate of Enforcement

on February 1, 2021 and February 8, 2021 and has submitted the statement. K. Raheja Corporate Services Private Limited has by its letter dated February 12, 2021 submitted the financial statements on behalf of Sentinel and its erstwhile directors as required by the Directorate of Enforcement.

(iii) Regulatory actions

1. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Mr. Ravi C. Raheja and others. For details, see "Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions". Mr. Ravi C. Raheja received a notice dated November 27, 2018 from the Income Tax Department in relation to certain transactions entered into by certain KRC group persons, including Mr. Ravi C. Raheja. For details, see "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – MBPPL – Regulatory Actions". Further, Mr. Ravi C. Raheja has received notice dated December 9, 2019 under Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, to file his income tax return for assessment year 2008-09 within five days from the date of service of notice and the return has been filed with the Income Tax Department. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Mr. Ravi C. Raheja received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment years 2008-2009, 2012-2013 to 2017-2018 and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, for assessment year 2018-2019, for an aggregate demand of ₹ 2.71 million. Mr. Ravi C. Raheja has filed rectification applications which are pending before the relevant authority. Certain rectification applications have been processed by the relevant authority granting an aggregate refund of ₹ 0.11 million.
2. The Assistant Director, Directorate of Enforcement, Mumbai ("ED") has on February 2, 2018 issued summons under Section 50 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, calling upon Mr. Ravi C. Raheja to attend before the ED and to give evidence, details and documents of land purchased at Pirangut, Pune. The land was purchased from Jay Agrotech Private Limited by Pact Real Estate Private Limited pursuant to sale deeds dated March 17, 2008 and July 4, 2008. Mr. Ravi C. Raheja is an erstwhile director of Pact Real Estate Private Limited and was not a director of Pact Real Estate Private Limited as on date of the summons. Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, in his reply dated February 10, 2018, has submitted the documents sought by the ED. After the information sought by ED was provided, there has been no further communications or requisitions for attendance or otherwise, from the ED, in that regard.
3. The Department of Labour, Government of Karnataka ("Labour Department") issued a show cause notice dated December 6, 2019 addressed to Chalet Hotels and Mr. Ravi C. Raheja and Mr. Neel C. Raheja (in their capacity as directors of Chalet Hotels) for failure to submit compliance report in relation to inspection carried out by the Labour Department and sought to take action for violations of certain labour laws. Chalet Hotels submitted its response, by its letter dated December 24, 2019 and provided the requisite information. Thereafter,

the Labour Department issued a further notice dated January 18, 2020 with respect to production of certain registers and documents for their inspection, which was submitted by Chalet Hotels. No further correspondence has been received.

4. For other pending material civil/ commercial litigation against Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, see "Material litigation and regulatory actions pending involving the Sponsor Group - Inorbit Malls - Regulatory actions".

(iv) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. Powai Developers, Mr. Ravi C. Raheja and another ("Petitioners") have filed a special leave petition ("SLP") before the Supreme Court of India against the State of Maharashtra and three others ("Respondents"). The SLP has been filed against the judgement dated September 3, 2014 passed by the Bombay High Court in respect of the applicability of the provisions of Section 3(1)(b) of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Repeal Act, 1999. By an order dated December 15, 2014, the Supreme Court of India issued a notice and restrained the Respondents from taking any coercive steps. KRCPL is the sole proprietor of Powai Developers. The matter is currently pending before the Supreme Court of India.
2. Ivory Properties and Mr. Ravi C. Raheja have filed two separate writ petitions before the Bombay High Court ("Court") against the State of Maharashtra, Nusli N. Wadia and others, for inter alia quashing and setting aside (i) a notification dated July 20, 2007, a notice dated March 1, 2016 and a notice dated August 30, 2016 passed under the provisions of the Maharashtra Slum Areas (Improvement, Clearance and Development) Act, 1971 for acquiring property admeasuring approximately 7758 square meters. Nusli N. Wadia has also filed similar writ petition before the Court against the State of Maharashtra and Ivory Properties on similar grounds. The arguments have concluded in the writ petitions filed by Ivory and Nusli N. Wadia and are pending for orders; (ii) an order dated October 25, 2017 for acquiring property admeasuring approximately 8255.30 square meters, situated at Borivali. By an order dated November 26, 2019, the writ petition was disposed off as withdrawn with liberty to make representation to the State Government. Ivory Properties has filed its representation. Nusli N. Wadia had also filed similar writ petition before the Court against the State of Maharashtra and Ivory Properties on similar grounds. The writ petition filed by Nusli N. Wadia was dismissed with observation that the petitioner can always approach the Court after the notification under Section 14 is issued and leaving all contentions of the parties open.
3. Ivory Properties and Mr. Ravi C. Raheja ("Petitioners") filed a writ petition before the Bombay High Court ("High Court") against the State of Maharashtra and six others ("Defendants") inter alia seeking an order from the High Court for restraining the State of Maharashtra & others from enforcing the conditions of exemption order dated February 19, 1996 read with corrigendum thereto dated May 5, 1997 and June 23, 2004 in respect of the lands at Malad, Mumbai for which Ivory Properties has development and other rights under the 1995 Agreement. In similar proceedings filed before it, the High Court vide order dated September 3, 2014 ("Order") inter alia held

- that conditions of exemptions under section 20 of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976 remain enforceable and the pending writ petitions must be disposed of in light of the principles laid down in the said judgement and on merits and in accordance with law. Pursuant thereto, numerous special leave petitions (“SLPs”) were filed before the Supreme Court of India challenging the Order. Supreme Court of India vide its order dated November 10, 2014 directed the State of Maharashtra & others not to take any coercive steps till final disposal of the matters before it. The Supreme Court disposed of the SLPs permitting the respondent (State) to implement the recommendations made in the report dated August 9, 2018 by the committee headed by Hon’ble Justice B.N. Srikrishna (retd.) with further clarification that if any of the categories of exemption was not covered in the report, it was open to such exemption holders to make representations to the Government.
4. Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja, KRCPL, Ivory Properties, Palm Shelter, KRPL and 20 others filed an appeal (“**Appeal**”) under Section 10F of the Companies Act, 1956 before the Bombay High Court (“**High Court**”) against Aasia Properties Private Limited (“**Aasia**”) and two others, against order dated September 19, 2006 (“**Order**”) passed by the CLB, New Delhi in company petition 91/2005, which granted permission to Aasia, to appoint its nominee as a non-functional director on the board of Juhu Beach Resorts Limited. The Court vide an interim order dated November 21, 2008, stayed the order till the pendency of the Appeal. The matter is currently pending before the High Court.
 5. Aasia Properties Private Limited (“**Aasia**”) filed an appeal (“**Appeal**”) under Section 10F of the Companies Act, 1956 before the Bombay High Court (“**Court**”) against Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja, KRCPL, Ivory Properties, Palm Shelter, KRPL and 20 others (“**Respondents**”), with respect to order dated September 19, 2006 passed by the CLB, New Delhi which dismissed the petition filed for declaring the transfer of 633 shares of Poonam Chand Shah/ Manjula P. Shah in favour of certain respondents as null & void, set aside subsequent transfers of such shares to other Respondents, subsequent rights issues of such shares be transferred to the Petitioners and other consequential reliefs. The matter is currently pending before the Court.
 6. Shazad S. Rustomji and another (“**Plaintiffs**”) have filed a suit before the Bombay High Court (“**Court**”) against Ivory Properties, Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja and others inter alia for declaring the deed of declaration dated October 25, 2011 executed and registered by Ivory Properties for submitting the building Serenity Heights under the Maharashtra Apartment Ownership Act, 1970 and the consequent formation of the Serenity Heights condominium, as illegal and void and not binding upon the Plaintiffs. The Court, in its order dated April 24, 2016, has refused to grant ad-interim relief to the Plaintiffs. Ivory Properties Mr. Ravi C. Raheja and Mr. Neel C. Raheja have filed an application for rejection of the plaint on grounds that the present suit is barred by the law of limitation. The matter is currently pending before the Court.
 7. Mr. Ravi C. Raheja and others (“**Petitioners**”) have filed a writ petition before the Bombay High Court against State of Maharashtra and others (“**Defendants**”), for directing the Defendants for withdrawing the letter dated June 8, 2008 which gave retrospective effect to the notification dated June 9, 2008 amending Rule 22A of the Bombay Stamp Rule, 1939 and setting aside the aforementioned notification. The Petitioners have also sought a refund of stamp duty aggregating to ₹ 6.21 million along with interest. The matter is currently pending before the Bombay High Court.
 8. Gopal L. Raheja and eight others (“**Petitioners**”) have filed company petition before the CLB / NCLT, Mumbai (“**CLB/ NCLT**”), against Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja and five others (“**Respondents**”), under Sections 397 and 398 of the Companies Act, 1956 inter alia alleging oppression and mismanagement by the Respondents in respect of the business and management of Asiatic Properties Limited. The matter is currently pending before the NCLT. Seacrust Properties Private Limited and Sandeep G. Raheja, the Petitioners, filed company applications against Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja and others for alleged violation of certain orders of the CLB/NLT and alleged acts of perjury by making false statements. The company applications were dismissed by the CLB/ NCLT vide its orders dated January 8, 2013 and February 7, 2013 (“**Orders**”). Aggrieved by the Orders, Seacrust Properties Private Limited and Sandeep G. Raheja have filed separate appeals before the Bombay High Court. The matters are currently pending before the Court Bombay High.
 9. Tresorie Traders Private Limited has filed a company petition before the NCLT, Mumbai under sections 247(1A) and 250 of the Companies Act, 1956 against Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja and others inter alia for investigation in respect of the membership, financial interest and control over two companies i.e. Club Cabana Recreation Private Limited and Sai Park Estate Developers (India) Private Limited and for restricting the transfer, fresh issue, exercise of voting rights and payment of dividend of the said companies. The matter is currently pending before the NCLT, Mumbai.
 10. Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja and Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja (“**Plaintiffs/CLR**”) filed a civil suit before the Bombay High Court (“**High Court**”) against Gopal L. Raheja, Sandeep G. Raheja, Durga S. Raheja, Sabita R. Narang and Sonali N. Arora (“**Defendants/GLR**”).
- The Plaintiffs and the Defendants were the persons primarily involved in the operation and management of the activities and businesses of the group known as K. Raheja Group in certain cities of Western and Southern India. However, certain disputes and differences arose between the CLR group and the GLR group that threatened the running of the business of the K. Raheja Group.
- After attempts to amicably resolve and finally settle the disputes and differences between the two groups in order to avoid protracting the matter any further, GLR and CLR decided to split/partition entities and assets

of the K. Raheja Group between them and accordingly a list indicating division of certain individual assets was executed in May 1995. On April 5, 1996 and November 16, 1996, further written agreements were executed wherein the manner, method and procedure of the division was agreed upon by the parties. Thereafter, on December 9, 1996, GLR and CLR groups made further confirmations to enable the division of certain assets in the agreed manner which was duly completed in respect of a portion of the assets, businesses and entities of the K. Raheja Group. The agreements and writings referred to above i.e. dated May 1995, April 5, 1996, November 16, 1996 and December 9, 1996 are collectively referred to as the **"Family Arrangement Documents"**.

Further, apart from the entities, assets and businesses of the two groups which were divided as above, there are additional properties and entities, the separation and distribution of which remained unresolved due to the differences between the groups. The two groups had agreed to take steps to divide these undivided properties comprising various companies, partnership firms, trusts and also certain properties situated at Mumbai i.e. the **"Mumbai Undivided Entities"** and situated in South India i.e. the **"Southern Undivided Entities"** along with certain other residual properties (collectively referred to as the **"Balance Properties"**). Further, the distribution and ascertainment of the monies payable/receivable did not transpire and certain disputes again arose between GLR and CLR in respect of the division of the Balance Properties, the management of certain entities and other such disputes.

After various correspondences between the two groups over the course of more than two decades to amicably resolve the disputes, the present suit was filed by the Plaintiffs inter alia seeking enforcement/

implementation of the family arrangement documents. The Plaintiffs have alleged that the arrangement was only partially implemented and inter alia alleged that certain arrangements were wrongly implemented. The Plaintiffs have further alleged that due to the inactivity in management of the undivided companies, the registrar of companies has struck-off and dissolved certain of these companies. The Plaintiffs have inter alia prayed for implementation of the Family Arrangement Documents, restoration of the companies that have been struck-off/dissolved, division of the companies situated in South India in the manner agreed by the parties and also for injunction restraining the Defendants from creating third party interests and/or encumbrances upon the properties that are the subject matter of the family arrangement. The Defendant nos.2 and 3 have filed their written statement on record along with a counter-claim inter alia praying for dismissal of the suit filed by the Plaintiffs and to fully implement the Family Arrangement Documents. The matter is currently pending before the High Court.

The GLR group also filed suits before the High Court pursuant to the family arrangement against the Plaintiffs alleging liability/obligation of the Plaintiffs to hand over certain title deeds, documents and papers and other assets belonging to the GLR group which are allegedly in the custody of the Plaintiffs and also seeking injunction for handover of the same to the GLR group. The matters are currently pending before the High Court.

The Mumbai Undivided Entities are as follows:

Partnership Firms	Limited Companies
1. Alankar Enterprises	1. Canvera Properties Private Limited
2. Crystal Corporation & Everest Enterprises	2. Carlton Trading Private Limited
3. Crown Enterprises	3. Debonair Estate Development Private Limited
4. Evergreen Construction	4. Dindoshila Estate Developers Private Limited
5. Honey Dew Corporation	5. East Lawn Resorts Limited
6. Kenwood Enterprises	6. Fems Estate (India) Private Limited
7. K. Raheja Financiers & Investors	7. Hill Queen Estate Development Private Limited
8. K. R. Finance	8. Juhuchandra Agro & Development Private Limited
9. K. R. Properties & Investments	9. K. R. Consultants Private Limited
10. K. R. Sales Corporation	10. K. R. Developers Private Limited
11. Marina Corporation	11. K. Raheja Trusteeship Private Limited
12. Oriental Corporation	12. Lakeside Hotels Limited
13. Powai Properties	13. Nectar Properties Private Limited
14. R. M. Development Corporation	14. Neel Estates Private Limited
15. Ruby Enterprises	15. Oyster Shell Estate Development Private Limited
16. Satguru Enterprises	16. Peninsular Housing Finance Private Limited
	17. Rendezvous Estate Private Limited
	18. Raheja Hotels Limited
	19. Sea Breeze Estate Development Private Limited
	20. Sevaram Estate Private Limited
	21. S. K. Estates Private Limited
	22. Springleaf Properties Private Limited

Partnership Firms	Limited Companies
	23. Suruchi Trading Private Limited
	24. Wiseman Finance Private Limited
Association of Persons	Trusts / Charitable Trusts
K. Raheja Investments & Finance	1. K. R. Foundation
	2. Raheja Charitable Trust
Private Trusts	
1. Lachmandas Raheja Family Trust	
2. L. R. Combine	
3. S. R. Combine	
4. Reshma Associates	
5. R. N. Associates	
6. R. K. Associates	
7. Various discretionary trusts (about 288 Nos.) Southern Undivided Entities	
Partnership Firms	Limited Companies
K Raheja Development Corporation	1. Mass Traders Private Limited
	2. K. Raheja Hotels & Estates Private Limited
	3. K. Raheja Development & Constructions Private Limited
	4. Ashoka Apartments Private Limited
	5. Asiatic Properties Limited
Trusts / Charitable Trusts	
1. R&M Trust	
2. Raj Trust	

In relation to the above mentioned undivided entities, the Plaintiffs have been served with various notices issued by regulatory authorities in respect of certain non-compliance. These notices have been replied to in the capacity of shareholders as the family settlement has not been fully implemented. No further correspondence has been received. The Plaintiffs have resigned from their directorship in the undivided companies in which they were directors.

11. Sealtite Gaskets Private Limited and six others ("**Petitioners**") have filed company petition before the CLB / NCLT, Chennai under Sections 397, 398, 399, 402, 403 and 406 of the Companies Act, 1956 against Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja and Chandru C. Raheja and four others ("**Respondents**") inter alia in respect of alleged oppression and mismanagement by the Respondents in respect of the business and management of K. Raheja Hotels and Estates Private Limited. By order dated February 2, 2017, the matter was transferred to NCLT, Bengaluru. The matter is currently pending before the NCLT, Bangalore.
12. Mr. Ravi C. Raheja and Mr. Neel C. Raheja ("**Petitioners**") have filed a writ petition before the Karnataka High Court at Bengaluru ("**Court**") against the Union of India and Registrar of Companies, Bengaluru ("**RoC**") ("**Respondents**") challenging the wrongful inclusion of their names in the list released by the RoC on its website in relation to the directors disqualified under the provisions of Section 164(2) the Companies Act, 2013, for the periods ending October 31, 2019 and October 31, 2020 in relation to non-filing of financial statements or annual returns for a continuous period of three financial years by K Raheja Hotels and Estates Private Limited (since the Petitioners were not directors of K Raheja Hotels and Estates Private Limited at the relevant time, having already resigned therefrom). By its order dated June 12, 2019 ("**Order**"), the Court has disposed of the writ petition filed by the Petitioners, along with a batch of several other writ petitions on the same matter and quashed the impugned list to the extent inter alia the disqualification of the Petitioners as directors was concerned. Pursuant to the Order, the Petitioners have filed a review application before the Court for issuing directions to the Respondents for deletion of the names of the Petitioners as directors of K Raheja Hotels and Estates Private Limited in the records of the Respondents, as was sought earlier in the writ petition. The Petitioners have filed a caveat on October 14, 2019 in anticipation of any appeal which the Respondents may file against the Order and subsequent adverse interim orders. The matter is currently pending before the Court. Further, the Petitioners through their reminder letter dated December 2, 2019 requested the administrator of K Raheja Hotels & Estate Private Limited to file requisite forms and ensure updates to the records of the RoC, in relation to resignation letters submitted by the Petitioners as directors of K Raheja Hotels & Estate Private Limited. The administrator, by letter dated December 26, 2019, stated that he was not in a position to accede to the aforementioned request unless relevant orders were granted in proceedings pending before the High Court, Karnataka and the CLB/NCLT to which the Petitioners have been impleaded as parties.
13. Pratik Rameshchandra Shah, through his power of attorney holder, Sambhuprasad Kurjibhai Lakkad, has filed an appeal before the Nayab Collector, Prant Officer Court, Viramgam District, Ahmedabad against the order of the Deputy Mamlatdar dated May 27, 2018 ("**Order**")

upholding the mutation entry made in the revenue records pursuant to sale of certain land for alleged wrongful sale of the disputed land in Sachana (in Gujarat) to Sentinel Properties Private Limited, where Mr. Ravi C. Raheja and Mr. Neel C. Raheja were erstwhile directors. The Deputy Collector passed an order dated February 13, 2019 in favour of the petitioner against which Sentinel Properties Private Limited has filed an appeal before the Gujarat High Court. The Gujarat High Court, by order dated February 25, 2020, vacated the interim relief granted by it against the order passed by the Deputy Collector. Pratik Rameshchandra Shah has also filed a suit before the Principal Civil Court, Ahmedabad against Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja and others (“**Respondents**”) and has sought cancellation of the Order and stay on further dealing of the disputed land in Sachana (in Gujarat) by the Respondents. The matters are currently pending before the relevant forums.

14. For other pending material civil/ commercial litigation against Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, see “-Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Title litigation and irregularities”.

B. Mr. Neel C. Raheja

(i) Criminal matters

For pending criminal matters against Mr. Neel C. Raheja, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Ravi C. Raheja – Criminal matters”.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Mr. Neel C. Raheja and others. For details, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions”. Mr. Neel C. Raheja received a notice dated November 27, 2018 from the Income Tax Department in relation to certain transactions entered into by certain KRC group persons, including Neel C. Raheja and the block assessment proceedings are ongoing. For details, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – MBPPL – Regulatory Actions”. Further, Mr. Neel C. Raheja has received notice dated December 9, 2019 under Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, to file his income tax return for assessment year 2008-09 within five days from the date of service of notice and the return has been filed with the Income Tax Department. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Mr. Neel C. Raheja received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment years 2008-2009, 2012-2013 to 2017-2018) and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, assessment year 2018-2019, for an aggregate demand of ₹ 3.16 million. Mr. Neel C. Raheja has filed rectification applications and appeals which are pending before the relevant authority. Certain rectification applications have been processed by the relevant authority decreasing the aggregate demand to ₹ 0.33 million.
2. The Assistant Director, Directorate of Enforcement, Mumbai (“**ED**”) has issued summons dated February 2, 2018

under Section 50 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, calling upon Mr. Neel C. Raheja to attend before the ED and to give evidence, details and documents of land purchased at Pirangut, Pune. The land was purchased from Jay Agrotech Private Limited by Pact Real Estate Private Limited pursuant to sale deeds dated March 17, 2008 and July 4, 2008. Mr. Neel C. Raheja is an erstwhile director of Pact Real Estate Private Limited and was not a director of Pact Real Estate Private Limited as on date of the summons. Mr. Neel C. Raheja, by his letter dated February 12, 2018, has submitted the documents sought by the ED. After the information sought by ED was provided, there has been no further communications or requisitions for attendance or otherwise, from the ED, in that regard.

3. The Enforcement Directorate, Delhi (“**ED**”) had issued a summons on December 20, 2017 against “The Director, M/s Carlton Trading Company” under Section 50 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (“**PMLA**”) to appear before the ED and produce certain documents relating to consultancy / services provided by Advantage Strategic Consulting Private Limited (“**ASCPL**”) and Chess Management Services Private Limited (“**CMSPL**”) to Carlton Trading Company. A written reply was filed with the ED on January 5, 2018 by legal counsel to Mr. Neel C. Raheja on his behalf, as a shareholder and ex-director of Carlton Trading Private Limited (“**CTPL**”), inter alia that (i) the summons was addressed to the Director, Carlton Trading Company, Mumbai, with whom Mr. Neel C Raheja is not concerned, and therefore, the same appears to have been delivered to the office address of Mr. Neel C Raheja under a mistaken identity; (ii) Mr. Neel C Raheja was no longer a director of CTPL, and (iii) to the best of his knowledge, CTPL has not had any dealing either with ASCPL or CMSPL. A background of CTPL and resignation of its directors was provided to the ED along with copies of the memorandum of association/articles of association and other details relating to CTPL. A further similar summons dated July 13, 2018 was issued by the ED, pursuant to which Mr. Neel C. Raheja’s legal counsel attended the office of ED on July 23, 2018 where the ED informed Mr. Neel C. Raheja’s legal counsel, that the summons issued by ED was not for Mr. Neel C Raheja (as a detailed response had already been submitted on behalf of Mr. Neel C Raheja in relation to the previous summons, and that Mr. Neel C. Raheja’s legal counsel, was not required for the hearing at all as the summons was not for Mr. Neel C Raheja). No further correspondence has been received thereafter.
4. The Assistant Director, Directorate of Enforcement, Mumbai has issued a notice in the year 2017 under section 37 of the FEMA calling upon Mr. Neel C. Raheja to furnish details and justification in respect of all foreign inward/outward remittances, with documentary evidences, sources of income, purpose for remittances and other related details, for the years 2005, 2007 and 2010. Mr. Neel C. Raheja has replied to the notice in the year 2017 furnishing the required details / information / documents and inter alia stated that the remittances were made in accordance with applicable FEMA regulations. By a subsequent letter, Mr. Neel C. Raheja referred to the aforesaid correspondence and stated that he had, through authorized representative, furnished the required details /

information / documents, and understood that they were to the authority's satisfaction. He further requested to be informed in case of any further requirement or explanation, in the absence of which it would be understood that he has satisfactorily carried out the statutory compliances relating to closure of the matter. No further correspondence has been received.

5. For other pending regulatory actions against Mr. Neel C. Raheja, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Ravi C. Raheja – Regulatory Actions”.
6. For other pending material civil/ commercial litigation against Mr. Neel C. Raheja, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending involving the Sponsor Group - Inorbit Malls - Regulatory actions”.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. Sandeep G. Raheja has filed a suit against Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja and others before the Bombay High Court (“**Court**”) in respect of a private family trust and removal of certain trustees therefrom and also for the dissolution, distribution and settlement of the accounts of the private family trust. The Court vide order dated November 16, 2006 had appointed an administrator, who subsequently resigned from his position and a new administrator has been appointed. The matter is currently pending before the Court.
2. For other pending material civil / commercial litigation against Mr. Neel C. Raheja, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Ravi C. Raheja – Material civil/commercial litigation” and “-Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Title litigation and irregularities”.

C. Mr. Chandru L. Raheja

(i) Criminal matters

1. The Dy. Superintendent of Police, Criminal Investigation Department (“**CID**”) had issued letter dated June 9, 2008 to Mr. Chandru L. Raheja (in relation to a project of KRPL known as Raheja Woods) in connection with an investigation in Swargate Police Station, Pune, in respect of the ULC case No. 23 – WA, S. No. 222/1 (“**ULC proceedings**”). KRPL is not a party to the ULC proceedings, however KRPL has appeared before CID and also replied with a letter dated June 11, 2008 submitting the requisite documents. Subsequently, pursuant to an application filed for the copy of chargesheet filed with respect to the above matter and on receipt of the same, it was noted that the Swargate Police Station had filed a chargesheet in the year 2005 with respect to the investigation wherein neither KRPL nor Mr. Chandru L. Raheja were named as accused. No further correspondence has been received.
2. For other pending criminal matters against Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Ravi C. Raheja – Criminal matters”.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. The Chairman/Secretary of Jaldarshan Co-op. Hsg. Society Ltd. filed two applications in the year 2017

against M.R.Combine, Ram Narayana Sons Pvt. Ltd., S.M. Builders, Parmeshwar Mittal, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, Lohtse Co-Op. Hsg. Soc. Ltd, K.F. Bearing Co. and others before the District Deputy Registrar, Co-op. Societies, Mumbai under Section 11 of the Maharashtra Ownership Flats (Regulation of the promotion of construction, sale, management and transfer) Act, 1963 in relation to deemed conveyance for conveying title to the society. The Registrar has issued notices dated January 30, 2018 and May 8, 2018. Mr. Chandru L. Raheja has received notice to file reply and/or appear before the Deputy Registrar. No further correspondence has been received.

2. Juhu Beach Resorts Limited has made a compounding application to the Registrar of Companies, Mumbai, for non-compliance of certain statutory filings required under Section 149(1)(a) of the Companies Act resulting from a technical error pursuant to the expiry of terms of two of its directors. Mr. Chandru L. Raheja is a director on board of Juhu Beach Resorts Limited. The matter has been referred to the e-governance cell of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, New Delhi for further assistance in complying with the statutory filings and proceeding with the compounding application. Upon the required assistance being provided by the Ministry, Juhu Beach Resorts Limited has filed the requisite documents with the Registrar of Companies, Mumbai. No further correspondence has been received.
3. The Office of the Medical Officer of Health, MCGM, has issued an inspection report dated September 20, 2019 to Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, in his capacity as director of Juhu Beach Resorts Ltd. pertaining to carrying out the activity of eating house from the basement of J.W. Marriot Hotel, Juhu without license. Juhu Beach Resorts Ltd. has responded to the inspection report on November 25, 2019. No further correspondence has been received.
4. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Mr. Chandru L. Raheja and others. For details, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions”. Mr. Chandru L. Raheja received a notice dated November 27, 2018 from the Income Tax Department in relation to certain transactions entered into by certain KRC group persons, including Mr. Chandru L. Raheja. For details, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – MBPPL – Regulatory Actions”. Further, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja has received notice dated December 9, 2019 under Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, to file his income tax return for assessment year 2008-09 within five days from the date of service of notice and the return has been filed with the Income Tax Department. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment years 2008-2009, 2012-2013 to 2017-2018) and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, assessment year 2018-2019 for an aggregate refund of ₹ 1.08 million.
5. The Assistant Director, Directorate of Enforcement, Mumbai has issued a notice in the year 2017 under section 37 of the FEMA calling upon Mr. Chandru L.

Raheja to furnish details and justification in respect of all foreign inward/outward remittances with documentary evidences, sources of income, purpose for remittances and other related details, for the years 2009, 2011 and 2012. Mr. Chandru L. Raheja has replied to the notice in the year 2017 furnishing the required details / information / documents and inter alia stated that the remittances were made in accordance with applicable FEMA regulations. By a subsequent letter, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja referred to the aforesaid correspondence and stated that he had, through authorized representative, furnished the required details / information / documents, and understood that they were to the authority's satisfaction. He further requested to be informed in case of any further requirement or explanation, in the absence of which it would be understood that he has satisfactorily carried out the statutory compliances relating to closure of the matter. No further correspondence has been received.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. Gopal L. Raheja and three others ("**Claimants**") have filed an arbitration petition ("**Petition**") under section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 ("**Act**") before the Bombay High Court ("**Court**") against Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, Ivory Properties, Casa Maria and others to set aside the award dated January 25, 2014 ("**Award**") passed by the single arbitrator, Justice Mr. Srikrishna (retd.). The Award did not grant any relief to the Claimant in respect of dissolution of the partnership firm K Raheja Development Corporation being one of the southern entities forming part of K Raheja southern division consisting of three groups being Gopal Raheja Group, Chandru Raheja Group & the Menda Group having 37.5%, 37.5% & 25. % respectively. The matter is currently pending before the Court.
2. Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, in his capacity as the attorney of Mr. Suresh L. Raheja, has filed a suit before the City Civil Court, Bombay ("**Court**") against Sultanath Shiraz and others ("**Defendants**") for specific performance of an agreement for sale executed by Mr. Suresh L. Raheja and some of the Defendants and has inter alia sought compensation of ₹ 0.55 million along with interest. The matter was dismissed by the Court pursuant to order dated April 20, 2019. An application has been made for restoring the matter before the Court.
3. KRPL and Mr. Chandru L. Raheja ("**Petitioners**") have filed a writ petition before the Bombay High Court ("**Court**") against the State of Maharashtra and others in respect of lands (Survey No. 22/1)_ situated at Yerwada, Pune and inter alia challenging the recovery of amounts and the stop work notices issued to KRPL pursuant to Urban Land Ceiling Act, 1976, the Urban land (Ceiling and Regulation) Repeal Act, 1999 and notice dated August 26, 2003 requiring to pay premium. Pursuant to an order dated April 7, 2010, the Petitioners have been allowed to continue with the development of the aforesaid lands. The matter is currently pending before the Court.
4. For other pending material civil / commercial litigation against Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, see "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Ravi C. Raheja – Material civil/commercial

litigation" and "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Neel C. Raheja – Material civil/commercial litigation".

D. Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja

(i) Criminal matters

There are no pending criminal matters against Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. The Assistant Director, Directorate of Enforcement, Mumbai has issued a notice in the year 2017 under section 37 of the FEMA calling upon Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja to furnish details and justification in respect of all foreign inward/outward remittances with documentary evidences, sources of income, purpose for remittances and other related details, for the years 2005, 2007 and 2010. Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja has replied to the notice in the year 2017 furnishing the required details / information / documents and inter alia stated that the remittances were made in accordance with applicable FEMA regulations. By a subsequent letter, Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja referred to the aforesaid correspondence and stated that she had, through authorized representative, furnished the required details / information / documents, and understood that they were to the authority's satisfaction. She further requested to be informed in case of any further requirement or explanation, in the absence of which it would be understood that she has satisfactorily carried out the statutory compliances relating to closure of the matter. No further correspondence has been received.
2. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja and others. For details, see "Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions". Further, Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja has received notice dated December 9, 2019 under Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, to file her income tax return for assessment year 2008-09 within five days from the date of service of notice and the return has been filed with the Income Tax Department. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment years 2008-2009, 2012-2013 to 2017-2018 and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, assessment year 2018-2019 for an aggregate demand of ₹Nil.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. For other pending material civil / commercial litigation against Mrs. Jyoti C. Raheja, see "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Ravi C. Raheja – Material civil/commercial litigation".

E. Casa Maria

(i) Criminal matters

There are no pending criminal matters against Casa Maria.

(ii) Regulatory actions

There are no pending regulatory actions against Casa Maria.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. For other pending material civil / commercial litigation against Casa Maria, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Chandru L. Raheja – Material civil/commercial litigation”.

F. Genext

(i) Criminal matters

There are no pending criminal matters against Genext.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. Proceedings were initiated before the monitoring committee of the MCGM for monitoring the re-development in respect of the property owned by Capricorn Realty Limited situated at Mahalaxmi, Mumbai which is being developed by Genext. A recent issue relating to giving additional allowances to ex-mill-workers employed in the project was agreed and settled in the Monitoring Committee’s Meeting held on June 6, 2018. The matter is currently pending with the Monitoring Committee in respect of the employment of more mill workers in place of the mill workers who have left, retired or have expired in relation to the remaining work in the project.
2. Genext received demand notices from time to time, from the Collector of Stamps, Enforcement – II (“**Collector**”) relating to stamp duty and penalty on various agreements entered into with various parties aggregating to approximately ₹ 208 million. Genext submitted its replies to the Collector against all these demand notices, inter alia pointing out that Genext is not a party to the said agreements, and is not liable for any amount. After the hearing was held in these matters, no further communications / demands have been received from the Collector. Genext and KRCPL had also received a demand notice in 2014 from the Collector relating to stamp duty and penalty of approximately ₹ 55 million in respect of a deed of assignment dated August 6, 2007 between Genext and KRCPL. Genext submitted its reply inter alia stating that the document was duly adjudicated and accordingly the full stamp duty was paid thereon. After a hearing was held in the said case, no further communications / demands have been received thereafter.
3. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Genext and others. For details, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions”. Genext received a notice dated November 27, 2018 from the Income Tax Department in relation to certain transactions entered into by certain KRC group persons, including Genext. For details, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – MBPPL – Regulatory Actions”. Genext has received notice dated November 27, 2019 under Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, to file its income tax return for assessment year 2008-09 within seven days from the date of service of notice and the return has been filed with the Income Tax Department. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Genext received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment years 2012-2013 to 2017-2018 and under Section 143(3) of the

Income Tax Act, 1961, assessment year 2018-2019, for an aggregate demand of ₹ 670.07 million. Genext has filed rectification applications and appeals which are pending before the relevant authority. The assessment proceeding for assessment year 2008-2009 are ongoing. Certain rectification applications have been processed by the relevant authority granting an aggregate refund of ₹ 164.93 million.

4. The Pest Control Officer at MCGM issued 32 notices to Genext with respect to water stagnation at its Vivarea project site at Mahalakshmi, Mumbai and other related infringements of the Mumbai Municipal Corporation Act, 1888. Genext has replied to MCGM stating that they have taken corrective measures and requested MCGM to conduct inspection in order to close the matter. In relation to two of such notices, Genext has paid fines. No further correspondence has been received.
5. Genext received letter dated August 17, 2018 vide email dated August 21, 2018, and November 30, 2018 from the MCA directing it to provide certain information relating to Genext’s compliance with its corporate social responsibility obligations for the financial year 2015-16. Genext has submitted the information to the MCA as requested. No further correspondence has been received.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. Capricorn Realty Limited has filed a special leave petition before the Supreme Court of India challenging the final judgment of the Bombay High Court dated August 21, 2017 (“**Order**”) passed in public interest litigation no.6/2016 in respect of the interpretation of the development control regulations of Greater Mumbai and the computation of the Floor-Space Index (FSI) liable to be granted. KRCPL has obtained the development rights of the subject matter lands from Capricorn Realty Limited, and has further assigned the same to Genext. The Supreme Court of India vide its order dated November 27, 2017 has stayed the Order. The matter is currently pending before the Supreme Court of India.

G. Inorbit Malls

(i) Criminal matters

1. Inorbit Malls along with others received a notice dated January 22, 2019 from the Sub-Inspector of Police, Madhapur police station, Hyderabad in relation to a criminal complaint filed by MD Ghouse Mohiddin against Trion, Inorbit Malls and others for allegedly committing fraud amounting to ₹ 2.5 million. Trion and Inorbit Malls replied to the notice on January 24, 2019 stating that there is no privity of contract between the Complainant and themselves. The matter is currently pending before the Madhapur police station, Hyderabad.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. From time to time, various inspections have been carried out by Labour officers and inspectors in respect of compliances by the company with the labour laws, rules and regulations. Inorbit Malls has filed its replies and submissions in respect of such inspections from time to time.
2. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Inorbit Malls and others. For details,

see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions”. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Inorbit Malls received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment years 2012-2013 to 2017-2018) and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, assessment year 2018-2019, for an aggregate refund of ₹ 94.75 million. Inorbit Malls has filed rectification applications and appeals which are pending before the relevant authority. Certain rectification applications have been processed by the relevant authority increasing the aggregate refund to ₹ 211.74 million.

3. Pursuant to the inspection report by Security Guards Board for Brihanmumbai and Thane District (“**Board**”), the Board issued a show cause notice dated October 13, 2014, in respect of the project at Vashi and alleged contraventions by Inorbit Malls under the provisions of the Maharashtra Private Security Guards (Regulation of Employment and Welfare) Act 1981 read with the Scheme of 2002. No further correspondence has been received thereafter.
4. Inorbit Malls received a notice dated November 4, 2018 from the Tahshildar under the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code in relation to alleged unauthorized excavation of minor minerals by Inorbit Malls. Inorbit Malls filed its written submissions on December 5, 2018 denying the allegations. Pursuant to a hearing before the Tehsildar, the matter was closed for passing of orders. The matter is currently pending before the Tahshildar.
5. A complaint was filed by Shamabai Govind Pilane on July 8, 2016, before the Municipal Commissioner, PMC alleging Inorbit Malls (Residential division) of undertaking illegal activities in relation to, inter alia, blocking of the road, changing topography of the land and attempting to erect fencing on the road which is sanctioned under Section 205 of the Bombay Provisional Municipal Corporations Act, 1949. There have been several letters sent by PMC to Inorbit Malls in this regard, from time to time. Inorbit Malls has responded to such letters denying the illegal activities alleged by the Municipal Commissioner. This matter is currently pending.
6. Several notices have been issued by the various stamp duty authorities to Inorbit Malls, in respect of deficit payment of stamp duty on certain agreements executed by Inorbit Malls aggregating to ₹ 2.75 million payable by Inorbit Malls and ₹ 1.77 million payable by the licensees. Inorbit Malls has submitted its replies from time to time inter alia denying the liability for stamp duty.
7. The BrihanMumbai Mahanagarपालिका Corporation (“**BMC**”) issued a letter dated January 10, 2020, to Inorbit Malls, pertaining to alleged unauthorized use of parking space, pursuant to an inspection by BMC and instructed Inorbit Malls to produce approvals/permissions obtained from competent authority within seven days of receipt of the letter. Inorbit Malls has, by letter dated January 15, 2020, responded to the letter stating that it was not illegally using open space as alleged by BMC. BMC, by letter dated January 28, 2020, replied stating that the said open space was marked for parking as per the latest approved plan and observed that Inorbit Malls has changed the location of recreation ground without obtaining permission of competent authority. BMC has further directed Inorbit Malls to restore/remove the unauthorized development as per the approved plan, failing which, the appropriate action shall be initiated against Inorbit Malls. No further correspondence has been received. The BMC, by its notice dated February 28, 2020 (“**Notice**”) issued under section 55 of the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act, 1966 (“**MRTP Act**”) directed Inorbit Malls to remove the unauthorized development i.e. Dais, Fountain, Kids Zone in parking space, within 15 days (fifteen days) from receipt of this Notice and sought to remove the unauthorized work and take action under the MRTP Act against Inorbit Malls in case of any failure. Inorbit Malls, by its reply letter dated March 13, 2020, submitted that revised proposal has been submitted to BMC, in respect of deleting podium parking and showing layout R.G. on ground with water fountain, Kids Zone and dias, and further requested the BMC to withdraw the Notice. By speaking order dated September 16, 2020 (“**Order**”), the BMC informed that for want of documentary evidence it is not proved that the work was authorized, and directed removal of the work. By reply dated September 19, 2020, Inorbit Malls inter alia submitted the copy of the completion certificate and plans issued by building and proposal department, showing that the parking tower has already been deleted and the recreation ground (“**RG**”) is shown on ground with water fountain and kids zone, which is allowed as per the Development Control and Promotion Regulation 2034 in the RG area; and requested to review and withdraw the speaking order and provide an opportunity to appear and explain the matter. By a notice dated October 23, 2020, BMC has directed Inorbit Malls to restore the premises as per the amended plan and completion certificate dated July 16, 2020. No further correspondence has been received.
8. The Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai (“**MCGM**”) issued a notice dated January 29, 2020, to Inorbit Malls, observing that during an inspection, certain illuminated advertisement board was displayed in Inorbit Mall without appropriate permission from MCGM under the Mumbai Municipal Corporation Act, 1888. Inorbit Malls, by letter dated February 3, 2020, replied to the notice stating that the advertisement board was in relation to products offered in the mall premises and have been removed pursuant to completion of the promotion of the products. No further correspondence has been received.
9. The Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai (“**MCGM**”) issued a notice dated February 14, 2020, to Inorbit Malls, observing that during an inspection, certain illuminated advertisement board was displayed in Inorbit Mall without appropriate permission from MCGM under the Mumbai Municipal Corporation Act, 1888. Inorbit Malls, by letter dated February 18, 2020, replied to the notice stating that the advertisement board was within the scope of the permit granted by the MCGM and was in relation to services available with many retailers in the mall premises for the benefit of general public visiting the mall premises and requested MCGM to withdraw its notice. No further correspondence has been received.

10. Inorbit Malls, along with Shri Dinesh Chandratre and others, through its constituted attorney Cavalcade Properties Private Limited ("**Cavalcade**") has filed an RTS Appeal bearing No. 119 of 2020 being aggrieved by the mutation entry No. 14839 dated July 19, 2019 thereby recording encumbrance in the other rights column on the VII XII in respect of land bearing Survey No. 27/1B+2+3 and 27/4 Village Mohammadwadi, Pune. The mutation entry was pursuant to the order dated March 18, 2013 in Case No. SR/300/12/2015 passed by the Tahsildar, Haveli under Section 48(7) of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966 for unauthorized excavation of minor minerals to the tune of ₹ 1,01,52,223 as per the Panchnama carried out by the Talathi office, Mohammadwadi, Pune. The RTS appeal was also filed for quashing of order of attachment of immovable property dated June 1, 2019 and February 5, 2020. Inorbit Malls has also filed an application for granting stay in the matter till the appeal is disposed of. On March 2, 2020, Inorbit Malls filed an application seeking permission to pay 25% of the total amount (under protest) thereby seeking stay to the further proceedings till the matter is disposed of on merits. The said application was allowed and the Hon'ble Sub Division Officer, Haveli Sub Division Pune ("**SDO**") by its letter dated March 2, 2020 directed the Tahsildar to take action for accepting the said 25% payment in Government Treasury. On March 3, 2020 Cavalcade made the aforesaid 25% payment under protest in SBI Treasury Branch. On March 9, 2020, the SDO issued a stay order till the final disposal of the matter on merits. By judgment dated October 9, 2020, the SDO has rejected the RTS appeal thereby vacating the stay granted earlier and ordered the Kamgar Talathi to take appropriate action for recovery as per rules. Inorbit Malls and Cavalcade have challenged the judgment dated October 9, 2020 by filing RTS Second Appeal dated January 20, 2021 before the Collector Pune. The matter is pending.
- Sheetalkumar Bhagchand Jadhav and another ("**Appellants**") have filed RTS Appeal No. 451 of 2020 against the Circle Officer - Mohammadwadi - Hadapsar, Inorbit Malls, Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Cavalcade Properties Private Limited ("**Cavalcade**") and others challenging the mutation of the name of Cavalcade vide Mutation Entry Nos. 15145 and 15146 both dated July 28, 2020 in respect of land bearing Survey No. 42 Hissa No. 2A admeasuring 32 Ares i.e. 3,200 square meters purchased by Cavalcade under two separate conveyance deeds both dated January 14, 2020 duly registered at Serial No. 2860/2020 and 2867/2020 at the office of Sub Registrar, Haveli No.10, Pune. The Sub Divisional Officer, Haveli, Pune (SDO) issued notice dated October 9, 2020 for appearance in the matter. By an order dated November 10, 2020, the SDO granted status-quo till final disposal of the case. By an order dated January 11, 2021 in the RTS Appeal, the status quo granted earlier by the order dated November 10, 2020 was vacated. The Appellants have challenged the order dated January 11, 2021 by filing a writ petition in the Bombay High Court on February 18, 2021. Both the proceedings are pending.
11. The BrihanMumbai Mahanagarपालिका ("**BMC**") has by letter dated November 6, 2020 ("**Letter**") instructed Inorbit Malls to stop alleged unauthorized on-going construction of cabins at Shop No. G-41 at Inorbit Mall, Malad and further directed Inorbit Malls to remove the alleged unauthorized work carried out without permission. Inorbit Malls is in process of replying to the Letter.
12. The Navi Mumbai Municipal Corporation ("**NMMC**") has by letter dated November 12, 2020 ("**NMMC Letter**") informed Inorbit Malls that the business operators / retailers are using the compulsory free space in front of their respective units at Inorbit Mall, Vashi ("**Mall**") which is unauthorized and need to operate only from the areas approved under their respective licenses and in accordance with terms and conditions as mentioned in the said licenses and applicable law. By reply letter dated November 20, 2020, Inorbit Malls has stated that it has noted the contents of the NMMC Letter and accordingly briefed the business operators / retailers to abide by their license conditions. No further correspondence has been received.
13. Inorbit Malls had completed construction of its building 19 constructed on Survey No. 2-4 (87), 6-9 & 10P, Annojiguda & Pocharam (Villages), Ghatkesar (M), Ranga Reddy District in Mindspace Pocharam project ("**Building**") without obtaining Environment Clearance ("**EC**"). Inorbit Malls has filed a sou-moto application dated September 12, 2017 ("**EC Application**") under a regularization scheme notified by MoEF vide notification dated March 14, 2017 for cases relating to construction without the requisite environment clearance, for regularization of the Building. The aforesaid application was considered as a case of violation and the State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority ("**SEIAA**") issued 'Standard Terms of Reference' issued by the MoEF, along with certain 'Specific Terms of Reference' ("**TOR**") which included, among others, obligation on the state government/ state pollution control board to take action against the project proponent under the provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986. As per the terms of the TOR, the Telangana State Pollution Control Board ("**TSPCB**") issued letter dated December 16, 2020 ("**Letter**") to Environment Engineer ("**EE**"), with a copy to Inorbit Malls, directing EE to ensure immediate stoppage of construction work and to enquire and take necessary action on alleged violation of the EIA Notification, 2006 against Inorbit Malls under the Environment Protection Act, 1986. SEIAA considered the above matter of Inorbit Malls in its meeting dated March 23, 2021 and has approved the issuance of EC subject to submission of bank guarantee of ₹ 3.76 million by Inorbit Malls for implementation of certain remedial and augmentation plans, along with detailed action plan for implementation. Inorbit Malls has submitted letter to the Member Secretary SEIAA, requesting to share bank guarantee format along with details of beneficiary for submission of bank guarantee.
14. The Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai ("**MCGM**") issued a show cause notice dated March 24, 2021 ("**SCN**"), to Inorbit Malls, alleging that the Inorbit Malls administration of its mall at Malad, Mumbai ("**Mall**") is not serious in following guidelines for COVID-19 testing under the MCGM circular for rapid antigen testing (RAT) dated March 19, 2021 ("**Circular**") and allowing customers to enter the mall without getting tested for COVID-19. By letter dated March 26, 2021 to MCGM, Inorbit Malls has

inter alia replied to the SCN stating that Inorbit Malls has followed all relevant circulars and guidelines as applicable for mall operations including the Circular and further requested MCGM to withdraw the SCN. No further correspondence has been received.

15. The Navi Mumbai Municipal Corporation (“**NMMC**”) issued a show cause notice dated March 28, 2021 (“**SCN**”) to Inorbit Malls, alleging that during the inspection on March 27, 2021, it has appeared that Inorbit Malls administration of its mall at Vashi, Navi Mumbai (“**Mall**”) is not serious in following guidelines for COVID-19 testing under the NMMC order dated March 23, 2021 for rapid antigen testing (RAT) and allowing customers to enter the mall without getting tested for COVID-19. Inorbit Malls is in the process of replying to the SCN.
16. For other regulatory actions pending against Inorbit Malls, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Associates of each of Mindspace REIT, the Sponsors and the Manager, and entities where any of the Sponsors hold any interest/shareholding – Chalet Hotels – Material civil/commercial litigation”.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. Shoppers Stop has filed special leave petitions before the Supreme Court of India (“**Court**”) against Government of India, Director General of Service Tax, Ministry of Finance Department, The Central Board of Excise and Customs and others in respect of order dated August 4, 2011 passed by the Bombay High Court in respect of levy of service tax for renting of immovable property. Inorbit Malls has been made party to the petitions. The matter is pending before the Court. A special leave petition has also been filed by Retailers Association of India (wherein licensees of Inorbit Malls are members) against the Union of India and others before the Court on similar grounds. Inorbit Malls is also a party to various special leave petitions filed by other licensees of Inorbit Malls. The matter is pending before the Court.
2. Wides Properties and Holdings has filed a special civil suit before the North Goa Civil Court against Inorbit Malls and others in respect of lands situated at Kadamba, Goa claiming that the property originally belonged to Arun Mambro’s family who had agreed to sale it to the plaintiff. The plaintiff’s application for temporary injunction was rejected in the year 2013. On June 11, 2019, the plaintiff filed an application to amend the plaint for adding certain additional grounds. The matter is pending for reply by Inorbit Malls and other defendants.
3. Inorbit Malls is involved in certain matters in relation to mutation of names upon the land records maintained by the government which are currently pending before their respective courts/authorities.
4. Arun Prabhu Mambro and others filed a special civil suit on against Inorbit Malls and 42 others before the North Goa – Civil Court, Panaji (“**Goa Court**”) in relation to three adjoining parts and parcels of land located in revenue village Panelim and Parish of St. Peter (“**Suit Property**”) claiming a right and interest over them and further alleging fraud committed by Mrs. Irene Barbosa in relation to manipulation of the land record to sell the Suit Property

to Inorbit Malls. The plaintiffs have sought, among others, (i) declare the additions of names and boundaries of properties and revenue orders as null and void; and (ii) removal of the structures on the Suit Property. The matter is currently pending.

5. Dattaram Xavier Fernandes and others have filed a special civil suit before the North Goa Civil Court (“**Court**”) against Inorbit Malls and others claiming tenancy over the lands situated at Kadamba, Goa and impugning Sale Deed dated October 9, 2006 executed in Inorbit Malls’ favour. The matter is pending before the Court.
6. KRCPL (“**Petitioner**”) has filed a special leave petition before the Supreme Court of India (“**SLP**”) against the common judgement and order dated November 20 and 21, 2014 (“**Impugned Judgement**”) passed by the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court in public interest litigation No. 131/2003 and No. 48/2004 (“**PIL Proceedings**”), which set aside the allotment certain plot with open spaces (“**Leasehold Land**”) by CIDCO to the Petitioner and directed KRCPL to handover the possession of the Leasehold Land in its original condition. Pursuant thereto, the Supreme Court of India, vide its order dated January 22, 2015 had directed the parties to maintain status-quo. The SLP is currently pending before the Supreme Court of India. Also pursuant to the liberty granted under the Impugned Judgment, the Petitioner has applied to the State Government for regularization of the allotment of land. The matter is currently pending with CIDCO.
7. In relation to an application for formation of co-operative society by Proposed Raheja Vistas Premiere Building T13 Maxima Co-operative Housing Society Limited, through its chief promoter in respect of Building T13 constructed by Inorbit Malls, the Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Society, Pune (“**Deputy Registrar**”) issued a notice under Maharashtra Ownership Flats Act (Regulation of the Promotion of Construction, Sale, Management and Transfer Act, 1963) requesting Inorbit Malls to appear for the hearing and file its written submission. Inorbit Malls has filed its objection in the matter. By Order dated December 21, 2020 (“**Order allowing application for formation of Society**”), the District Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Society, Pune City (“**District Deputy Registrar**”) allowed the application for formation of Raheja Vistas Premiere T13 Maxima Co-operative Housing Limited. In furtherance to the Order allowing application for formation of Society, by an order dated January 28, 2021, the Deputy Registrar issued the society registration certificate (“**Order and the Certificate**”) to Raheja Vistas Premiere T13 Maxima CHS Limited. Being aggrieved by the order dated January 28, 2021, Inorbit Malls has filed two appeals (“**Appeals**”) before the Divisional Joint Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Pune (“**Divisional Joint Registrar**”) for setting aside and quashing the Order allowing application for formation of Society, and Order and Certificate. In the said Appeals, Inorbit Malls has taken out two applications for stay both dated February 9, 2021 to stay the Order for allowing application for formation of Society, Order and the Certificate. By two separate orders both dated March 25, 2021 passed in the Appeals, the District Joint Registrar has stayed the Order allowing application for formation of Society and Order and the Certificate till the next date of hearing. The matter is pending.

8. Proposed Raheja Vistas Phase IV Building T5 and T6 Co-operative Housing Society Limited through its chief promoter Col. Kadur Malleshi ("**Plaintiff**") has filed a suit before the Civil Judge Senior Division, Pune ("**Civil Court**") against Inorbit Malls, (through its directors Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja and others) ("**Defendant**"), for inter alia declaring the deed of declaration dated February 11, 2019 executed by Inorbit Malls as illegal, null and void and non-binding upon the Plaintiff and has sought cancellation of the deed of declaration and permanent injunction restraining the Defendants from executing any deeds, documents and things in respect of the suit property on the basis of the impugned deed of declaration. The Court granted an ad interim status quo with respect to holding of any general body meeting or voting in pursuance of the deed of declaration. By order dated February 4, 2020, the Court rejected Plaintiff's injunction application. Consequently, the Plaintiff filed an application inter alia seeking extension of status-quo until the appeal period which was rejected by the Court. The matter is currently pending before the Civil Court.
9. Proposed Raheja Vistas Phase IV Building T5 and T6 Co-operative Housing Society Limited through its chief promoter Col. Kadur Malleshi ("**Applicant**") filed an application before District Deputy Registrar Co-operative Housing Societies against Inorbit Malls ("**Respondent**"), for formation of a co-operative society. On August 7, 2019, the Applicant filed an application for amendment thereby seeking addition of the names of Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja and others in the matter as directors of Inorbit Malls. The said application for amendment was allowed vide an order dated October 1, 2019 ("**Impugned Order**"). Aggrieved by the aforementioned order, Inorbit Malls filed a revision application on November 1, 2019 for quashing and setting aside the Impugned Order, before the Divisional Joint Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Pune. The Applicant filed a pursis giving its no-objection to the revision application being allowed and the Impugned Order being quashed and set aside. The revision application was allowed on November 26, 2019. The Application for society formation was allowed on January 29, 2020 and the society was registered on January 31, 2020. Aggrieved by the said orders, Inorbit Malls filed an appeal and revision application in both the matters before the Divisional Joint Registrar, Pune and an interim stay was granted by the Divisional Joint Registrar in both the matters on March 2, 2020. Aggrieved, Raheja Vistas Phase IV Building T5 and T6 Co-operative Housing Society Limited filed a civil writ petition in the Bombay High Court which was disposed of on June 23, 2020. By separate orders dated July 31, 2020, the appeal and revision application filed by Inorbit Malls were allowed by the Divisional Joint Registrar, Pune. The Raheja Vistas Phase IV Building Nos. T5 and T6 Co-operative Housing Society Limited have challenged the said orders by filing two separate civil writ petitions ("**CWP's**") in Bombay High Court. By an order dated September 21, 2020, the Bombay High Court directed the petitioners to comply with the order dated June 23, 2020 pertaining to payment of maintenance by the petitioner and the individual members to respondent no.1 i.e. Inorbit Malls in the earlier civil writ petition within a period of one week. On October 7, 2020, the petitioners submitted to the Bombay High Court that Raheja Vistas Phase IV Building T5 and T6 Co-operative Housing Society Limited had deposited on September 28, 2020, a sum of ₹ 1.99 million with Inorbit Malls pursuant to the Order dated September 21, 2020. Inorbit Malls thereafter objected to Petitioner's submission and informed the Bombay High Court that Inorbit Malls had reason to believe that more funds had been collected from the residents of the building and that Raheja Vistas Phase IV Building T5 and T6 Co-operative Housing Society Limited had not deposited the entire amount collected by them with Inorbit Malls. Inorbit Malls sought liberty to file a reply to the Affidavit filed by the petitioners/society dated September 29, 2020. On December 2, 2020, Bombay High Court directed the Petitioner to file its rejoinder with the registry and the rejoinder was filed by the Petitioner on the same date. On February 12, 2021, Inorbit Malls filed affidavit in sur rejoinder. The CWPs are pending for further hearing.
10. Yogesh Rameshbhai Suthar ("**Complainant**"), an employee of Deccan Techno Security and Utility Services ("**Deccan Techno**") has filed complaint before the Labour Court, Vadodara ("**Court**") against Inorbit Malls and Deccan Techno alleging wrongful transfer of the Complainant from Inorbit Malls to other location by Deccan Techno. Deccan Techno is a service provider of Inorbit Malls. In the said complaint, the Complainant has inter alia prayed for payment of the salary along with eligible benefits and consideration with effect from his day of transfer, reinstatement to his earlier place of deputation at Inorbit Malls, Vadodara and claim of ₹ 10,000 towards litigation expenses. Inorbit Malls is in the process of filing its written statement. The matter is pending before the Court.
11. For other pending material civil / commercial litigation against Inorbit Malls, see "-Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Title litigation and irregularities" and "-Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Associates of each of Mindspace REIT, the Sponsors and the Manager, and entities where any of the Sponsors hold any interest/shareholding – Chalet Hotels – Material civil/commercial litigation".
- H. Ivory Properties**
- (i) Criminal matters**
There are no pending criminal matters against Ivory Properties.
- (ii) Regulatory actions**
1. In response to applications made by Ivory Properties in relation to certain environmental clearances and approvals for a project at Malad, Mumbai and in relation to certain environmental approvals and provision for treatment plants for the sewage generated from the project, MPCB issued notices dated May 28, 2015 and December 17, 2014 and October 3, 2015, to Ivory Properties. Ivory Properties has responded to the said notice. By reply dated July 6, 2015 to the notice dated May 28, 2015, Ivory Properties withdrew the application for consent to establish (as it was inadvertently made) inter alia as the plinth for a building was already completed before the MoEF notification dated July 7, 2004 providing for obtaining environment clearance. In reply dated December 30, 2014 to the notice dated December 17, 2014, Ivory Properties pointed out

that the IT buildings referred by MPCB were completed in 2003, and provided details of the occupation certificates issued from 2001 to 2003.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. Oasis Restaurant and Amber, Oscar & Minor Canteens have filed a suit before the Bandra Civil Court (“**Court**”) against Ivory Properties and others for declaration as a tenant of the premises situated within the Shoppers Stop building in Andheri West, Mumbai. By judgment dated February 25, 2021, the Court has dismissed the suit and held that Oasis Restaurant and Amber, Oscar & Minor Canteens has failed to prove that (i) it is the tenant of Ivory Properties and others and (ii) it is in possession of the entire premises as alleged in the prayer clause of the suit and is therefore not entitled to the declaration and injunction as prayed for in the suit. The Oasis Restaurant and Amber, Oscar & Minor Canteens has not till date filed any appeal against the said judgment.
2. Bhanumati Bhuta and Vasantben Bhuta filed commercial arbitration petitions before the Bombay High Court (“**Court**”), to quash and set-aside the above arbitral award dated February 14, 2017 whereby the specific performance of a development agreement and memorandum of understanding both dated April 19, 1995, as modified, was granted to Ivory Properties. Pursuant to order dated January 28, 2020, the commercial arbitration petitions have been allowed and the award dated February 14, 2017 and interim orders of the arbitrator have been set aside by the Court. Ivory Properties has preferred an appeal before the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court from the order dated January 28, 2020 and the same is pending.
3. Shoppers Stop has filed a special leave petition before the Supreme Court of India (“**Court**”) against Government of India, the Director General of Service Tax, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, the Central Board of Excise and Customs and others in respect of order dated August 4, 2011 passed by the Bombay High Court in respect of levy of service tax for renting of immovable property. Ivory Properties has been made a party to the matter. The matter is currently pending before the Court.
4. Radhakrishna Properties Private Limited (“**Plaintiff**”) filed a suit before the Bombay High Court (“**Court**”) against Ivory Properties (“**Defendant**”) seeking specific performance of agreement to sub-lease dated April 6, 1995 executed by Ivory Properties in favour of the Plaintiff in respect of lands situated at Malad, Mumbai. Alternatively, the Plaintiff is seeking alternate compensation aggregating to ₹ 3,000 million. The Defendant has filed its written statement and counter-claim. The matter is pending before the Court.
5. For other pending material civil/commercial litigation against Ivory Properties, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Ravi C. Raheja – Material civil/commercial litigation”, “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Chandru L. Raheja – Material civil/commercial litigation” and “-Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Title litigation and irregularities”.

I. Ivory Property Trust

(i) Criminal matters

There are no pending regulatory actions against Ivory Property Trust.

(ii) Regulatory actions

There are no pending regulatory actions against Ivory Property Trust.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. Manilal & Sons (“**Manilal**”) has filed legal proceedings against Bombay Forgings Limited (“**BFL**”) relating to lease of lands at Kalina, Mumbai.

Ivory Property Trust has inter alia entered into memorandums of understanding to acquire from BFL its leasehold lands situate at Kalina, Mumbai (said Lands), pursuant to a rehabilitation scheme sanctioned by the Board of Industrial & Financial Reconstruction (“**BIFR**”) in respect of BFL (“**BIFR Scheme**”). The landowner-lessor i.e. Manilal challenged the BIFR Scheme and transfer of said Lands under the BIFR Scheme in favour of Ivory Property Trust. Both the BIFR and the Appellate Authority for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction (“**AAIFR**”) did not grant any relief to Manilal. Manilal has challenged the said orders of BIFR and AAIFR in a writ petition filed in the Bombay High Court (“**High Court**”). The High Court has directed that any changes brought about pursuant to the various orders passed shall be subject to the final decision in this petition. The matter is currently pending before the High Court.

2. Manilal had filed an eviction suit in the Small Causes Court, Bandra against BFL in respect of the lease of land at Kalina Mumbai, which was decreed in favour of Manilal in 2007, and an enquiry was directed for mesne profits. BFL challenged the said eviction order in appeal before the Appellate Bench of Small Causes Court, Bandra. Appeal was admitted, execution of eviction was stayed and BFL was ordered to deposit interim mesne profits at the rate of ₹ 0.02 million per month. Manilal has filed Mesne Profits Proceeding in the Small Causes Court, Bandra against BFL claiming ₹ 294.6 million as arrears of mesne profits with 9% interest p.a. up to August 31, 2007; and further ₹ 6.2 million per month with 15% interest p.a. from September 1, 2007 till handing over possession. On March 14, 2020, the Small Causes Court, Bandra allowed Manilal’s application to produce certified copy of case papers in relation to BFL’s RAD Suit No.310 of 2017. On August 31, 2020, BFL filed revision application against the said order dated March 14, 2020. By letter dated April 12, 2007, Ivory Property Trust has agreed with BFL not to claim refund of ₹ 190 million paid by Ivory Property Trust to BFL, and also that any condition by the appeal court for stay of execution of decree including deposit of interim mesne profit, if any, ordered will be exclusive liability of Ivory Property Trust. BFL has also filed a suit in the Small Causes Court, Bandra, for declarations in respect of its leasehold rights/tenancy in the said Lands and other relief relating to renewal/ extension of lease of the said lands and for damages in the alternative aggregating to ₹ 200 million. The matters are currently pending in the Small Causes Court, Bandra.

3. A suit is filed before the Bombay High Court (“**Court**”) by Matasons Estate Private Limited (“**Plaintiff**”) against Bombay Forgings Private Limited and Ivory Properties (“**Defendant**”) seeking specific performance of a development agreement for property situated at Kalina in Mumbai or compensation aggregating to ₹ 150 million along with interest of 18% p.a. The matter is currently pending before the Court.

J. KRCPL

(i) Criminal matters

1. Sunil Khare has filed a first information report dated March 3, 2013 with the Malawani Police Station, Mumbai against Anuj Prakash, general manager, of one of the hotels of KRCPL i.e. The Resort at Malad, Mumbai, for an incident at the hotel. The general manager applied for and has been granted bail. The matter is currently pending before the Sessions Court, Borivali.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. K Raheja Corp and Genext had received a demand notice from the Collector relating to stamp duty and penalty of approximately ₹ 55 million in respect of a deed of assignment dated August 6, 2007 between Genext and K Raheja Corp. Genext submitted its reply inter alia stating that the documents were duly adjudicated and accordingly full stamp duty was paid. After hearing was held in the said case, no further communications / demands have been received thereafter. K Raheja Corp had also received a demand notice from the Collector relation of stamp duty and penalty approximately of ₹ 50 million in respect of a deed of assignment dated August 6, 2007 between IDBI, K Raheja Corp and others. Genext submitted its reply inter alia stating that the documents were duly adjudicated and accordingly full stamp duty was paid. After hearing was held in the said case, no further communications / demands have been received thereafter.
2. Certain investigative proceedings have been initiated by the Superintendent of Police, Anti-Corruption Branch, Goa (“**ACB**”) against unnamed persons under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 in respect of allotment of SEZ lands by Goa Industrial Development Corporation to SEZ developers. Pursuant to the intimation dated March 14, 2013 received from the ACB in connection with enquiry, KRCPL’s representative has appeared before the ACB. No further correspondence has been received. As recorded in the orders of the Supreme Court of India in the certain civil appeals, some of the SEZ developers including KRCPL have surrendered the SEZ lands to Goa Industrial Development Corporation (“**GIDC**”). In the Government of Goa Cabinet note in July 2018 (obtained through an application made under the Right to Information Act, 2005), it was noted that the FIR filed by GIDC, pursuant to which the investigative proceedings were initiated by the ACB, was proposed to be withdrawn as no cause existed. It also stated that the Council of Ministers may resolve to approve, amongst others, the proposal to close the vigilance and other matters in view of settlement. Subsequently, the amounts have been refunded by GIDC to KRCPL together with interest.
3. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against KRCPL and others. For details,

see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions”. KRCPL received a notice dated November 27, 2018 from the Income Tax Department in relation to certain transactions entered into by certain KRC group persons, including KRCPL. For details, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – MBPPL – Regulatory Actions”. Further, KRCPL has received notice dated December 9, 2019 under Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, to file its income tax return for assessment year 2008-09 within five days from the date of service of notice and the return has been filed with the Income Tax Department. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, KRCPL received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment years 2008-2009, 2012-2013 to 2017-2018) and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, assessment year 2018-2019, for an aggregate demand of ₹ 712.65 million. KRCPL has filed rectification applications and appeals which are pending before the relevant authority. Certain rectification applications have been processed by the relevant authority decreasing the aggregate demand to ₹ 68.68 million.

4. The registrars of companies issued two notices dated March 29, 2017 and September 4, 2018 for striking/removal of the name of Powai Developers Private Limited from the register of companies. No further correspondence has been received.
5. The Tax Recovery Officer-11 has vide three separate letters one dated May 28, 2018 and two other dated June 6, 2018 addressed to the secretary / chairman / property manager of Raheja Vistas, project of Powai Developers (sole proprietary concern of KRCPL), informed them of the attachment of three flats of Raheja Vistas which belong to customers who have purchased these flats from Powai Developers. The Tax Recovery Officer-11 has further stated that the transfer of ownership of the same would be subject to payment of outstanding arrears of taxes of ₹ 320 million along with applicable interest thereon which is due from the flat purchasers. Powai Developers has responded to the letters. No further correspondence has been received.
6. KRCPL received an email dated December 4, 2018 from the MCA directing it to provide certain information relating to KRCPL’s compliance with its corporate social responsibility obligations for the financial year 2015-16. KRCPL has submitted the information to the MCA as requested. No further correspondence has been received.
7. For other regulatory actions against KRCPL, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Associates of each of Mindspace REIT, the Sponsors and the Manager, and entities where any of the Sponsors hold any interest/shareholding – Chalet Hotels – Regulatory Actions”.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (“**BPCL**”) filed a suit before the Bombay High Court (“**Court**”) against KRCPL and three others (“**Defendants**”) seeking specific performance of agreement dated December 5, 1952

- and a declaration that sale made in favour of KRCPL be declared null and void, and further seeking damages aggregating to ₹ 100 million. The matter is currently pending before the Court. The Defendants have filed a mesne profit proceeding suit before the Bandra Small Causes Court against BPCL for determining the mesne profits, wherein the claim of KRCPL as per a valuation report is made for ₹ 76 million. The matter is currently pending before the Bandra Small Causes Court.
2. Arthur D'Souza ("**Applicant**"), the owner of a land adjoining the land of KRCPL, made an application to the District Collector, Bandra, Mumbai ("**District Collector**") claiming title over certain portion of KRCPL's land bearing CTS No.119-G in village Tungawa in Mumbai. The District Collector passed orders dated May 26, 2009 and June 6, 2009 in favour of the Applicant. KRCPL preferred an appeal to the Additional Commissioner against the said orders. The Additional Commissioner, by his order dated February 17, 2010, upheld the orders passed by the District Collector. Aggrieved, KRCPL has preferred an appeal against the order of the Additional Commissioner before the Revenue Minister, Mantralaya. By letter dated March 3, 2021 to the advocate of the Applicant, the advocates of KRCPL have sought the details of the legal heirs and/or representatives of the Applicant as the Applicant has expired for taking out an appropriate application for the purpose of substituting the Applicant with his legal heirs/representatives and amending the cause title of the aforesaid appeal. The matter is currently pending before the Revenue Minister, Mantralaya.
 3. KRCPL and Indian Cork Mills Limited have filed a suit before the Bombay High Court against Sir Mohammed Yusuf Trust and others inter alia disputing the various claims made by the defendants and for declaration of the plaintiff's ownership of the certain land in village Tungawa at Mumbai. Further, in respect of the portions of the aforesaid lands, numerous proceedings and appeals before various revenue authorities have been filed between the parties. In the writ petition filed by KRCPL, by orders dated February 12, 2013 & order dated March 8, 2013 pending hearing excluding the disputed area of four acres and 11 gunthas bearing CTS No.119-G in village Tungawa in Mumbai claimed by the respondents, the Bombay High Court permitted KRCPL to continue development construction without any hindrance in the remaining area.
 4. Sir Mohammed Yusuf Trust and four others ("**Plaintiffs**") filed two separate suits before the Bombay High Court ("**Court**"), against KRCPL and two others ("**Defendants**"), seeking declarations that the Plaintiffs are the owners of land admeasuring 4 acres and 11 gunthas bearing CTS No.119-G and about eight acres bearing CTS No. 119F in village Tungawa in Mumbai. The Plaintiffs have further sought from the Defendants, demolition of the buildings constructed on the portions of land. In the alternative, the Plaintiffs are seeking damages aggregating to ₹ 15,000 million. In the second subsequent suit, in addition to the relief claimed in the first suit, the Plaintiffs have added various societies formed of the flat purchasers as party defendant and have sought injunction restraining execution of conveyances in favour of such societies of the flat purchasers. No relief has been granted to the Plaintiffs till date. The matter is currently pending before the Court.
 5. Sir Mohammed Yusuf Trust and four others ("**Petitioner**") filed a writ before the Bombay High Court ("**Court**"), against State of Maharashtra, KRCPL and two others ("**Respondent**"), inter alia for cancelling and setting aside the order passed by the city survey officer for reinstating the name of the Owner Indian Cork Mills Limited in the property register card as per the NA Order subject inter alia to the pending High Court Suit.
 6. Nakka Venkat Narsaiah ("**Plaintiff**") has filed a suit against Raheja Mind Space Corp and others ("**Defendants**") before the Additional Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District ("**Civil Court**"), inter alia for possession of land admeasuring 150 square yards, bordering the land of KRCPL. KRCPL has filed a written statement. The Civil Court has passed an interim order restraining the Defendants from alienating the land in favour of third parties. The matter is currently pending before the Civil Court.
 7. KRCPL agreed to acquire a property situated at Mahalaxmi, Mumbai under an agreement dated June 30, 2017 as per the provisions contained therein, in respect of which a suit has been filed before the Bombay City Civil Court ("**Court**") by Modern India Limited against Belvedere Court condominium, Arun Bewoor and others in respect of right of way. Another suit has been filed before the Court by Arun Bewoor and others against Modern India Limited ("**Modern**") and others claiming that the deed of covenant granting right of way to Modern was a gratuitous license and that defendant no.1 was not entitled to carry on construction on the Plot D other than textile mill thereon, beyond the height of 4th floor from ground level. The matter is currently pending. Modern has filed an application to conduct an inquiry by the Court and to pass appropriate orders against defendant no.1 for making false statement on oath thereby having committed perjury. The same is pending.
 8. Maharashtra Rajya Mathadi & Gumasta General Kamgar Sanghatana and one other ("**Petitioners**") have filed a writ petition against KRCPL, Chalet Hotels and others before the Bombay High Court alleging that certain workers have not been assigned the work of loading and unloading of the building and construction material at the site at Powai and unregistered workers continue to work at the site. The matter is pending before the Bombay High Court.
 9. For other pending material civil / commercial litigation against KRCPL, see "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Genext – Material civil/commercial litigation", "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Ravi C. Raheja – Material civil/commercial litigation", "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Associates of each of Mindspace REIT, the Sponsors and the Manager, and entities where any of the Sponsors hold any interest/shareholding – Chalet Hotels – Material civil/commercial litigation", "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Inorbit Malls – Material civil/commercial litigation" and see "-Material litigation

and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Title litigation and irregularities”.

K. KRPL

(i) Criminal matters

1. For criminal matters pending against KRPL, see “-Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Chandru L. Raheja – Criminal matters”.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. The MCGM, vide several letters addressed to KRPL, has demanded the handing over of Flat No. 102 on the first floor of the building known as “**Rosemary**” of Rosemary Correa Co-operative Housing Society Limited (“**Rosemary CHSL**”), Mumbai (“**Premises**”), contending it to be reserved as a municipal library and called upon KRPL to furnish the relevant papers. KRPL has responded to MCGM, stating that the Premises is to be run as a library by the owner for public in general and that the library will be open for public-use after completion of on-going repair work. However, the MCGM sealed the Premises on March 14, 2019. KRPL has called upon MCGM to forthwith restore possession of KRPL of the Premises and to remove the seal from the Premises at the earliest. Further the MCGM, by its letter dated July 27, 2019, to KRPL, threatened to register a FIR against KRPL for alleged trespassing in the Premises. MCGM has by its letter dated September 29, 2020 (received on October 8, 2020 from MCGM) to K Raheja Corp Foundation (“**KRC Foundation**”) alleged that it has violated the terms and conditions of the development permission as well as permission given by MCGM and directed KRC Foundation to submit its explanation for the alleged lapses. KRPL as the owner of the Premises, has by its letter dated October 14, 2020 replied to MCGM and clarified that it has acted in accordance with the terms of the development permission and that there is no requirement of handing over the Premises to MCGM. By the said letter, KRPL has once again requested MCGM to remove its seal from the Premises and also sought personal hearing to explain and clarify the misapprehensions in the matter. No further correspondence has been received.
2. The Pest Control Officer at MCGM has issued 44 notices to KRPL in respect of water stagnation at KRPL’s project site at Worli, Mumbai and other related infringements of the Mumbai Municipal Corporation Act. KRPL has replied to MCGM stating that they have taken corrective measures and requested MCGM to conduct inspection in order to close the matter. No further correspondence has been received.
3. The issues of levy of premium/transfer fees/lease tenure/enhanced lease rent etc. relating to Brihanmumbai Mahanagarpalika (“**MCGM Estates**”) two municipal leasehold properties acquired by KRPL are sub-judice before the Bombay High Court (“**Court**”) in various petitions filed by various lessees and other parties. KRPL is not a party to such proceedings and has not filed any petition in court in this respect. MCGM Estates had raised demands on KRPL for transfer premium and penalty and transfer fee relating to the assignments of the said properties at Worli in favour of KRPL which was paid

without prejudice & subject to all rights & contentions of the parties. KRPL has filed undertaking dated October 19, 2015 and July 16, 2015 with MCGM to abide by the final outcome in writ petition no.1251/2014 (“**Writ Petition**”) and any other proceedings from time to time in relation to the issues of levy of premium / transfer fees / lease tenure / enhanced lease rent. The writ petition is currently pending with several other similar matters before the Court.

4. The MCGM has issued a letter dated April 8, 2018 addressed to KRPL, in pursuance of letter dated March 12, 2018 (wrongly dated March 12, 2010) received by them from Association of Engineering Workers in respect of unpaid dues to labour/workers of Metal Box India Limited (“**MBIL**”) and for issuance of stop work notice of further construction of building situated at Worli, Mumbai. MBIL was the predecessor in title of KRPL. KRPL has issued letter dated May 14, 2018 responding to MCGM, denying all the allegations and informing that MBIL had deposited the entire gratuity dues of ex-workers. KRPL had also filed caveats in the Bombay City Civil Court and Bombay High Court for being given notice of any application for ad-interim orders in any proceeding that may be filed, which were renewed from time to time. Arun Kachare and Association of Engineering Workers filed a writ petition against State of Maharashtra, MCGM, MBIL and others before the Bombay High Court seeking, inter alia, in respect of alleged labour dues payable by MBIL and relating to alleged requirement of labour NOC for development of MBIL, and sought relief relating to the development approvals in respect of the suit property. Since relief was sought relating to development approvals with respect to the suit property, KRPL joined as a respondent in the matter. KRPL has inter alia contended that it is the title holder of the suit property, having acquired assignment of the lease pursuant to BIFR/AIFR proceedings and is not a closed company or liable for any dues of the workers of its predecessor in title i.e. MBIL. The matter is pending before the Bombay High Court.
5. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against KRCPL and others. For details, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions”. Pursuant to the search, the Income Tax Department issued notices each dated January 23, 2019 in pursuance of provisions of section 153C r.w.s. 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 directing KRPL to prepare and furnish true and correct returns of its total income for assessment years from 2012-13 to 2017-18 (“**Period of Investigation**”) by January 31, 2019 and these returns have been furnished before the Income Tax Department by KRPL. KRPL received a notice dated February 25, 2019 from the Income Tax Department in relation to certain transactions entered into by KRPL with Hypercity Retails India Ltd (“**HRIL**”) which is a subsidiary of Shoppers Stop wherein HRIL has booked profit of ₹ 1,751.52 million. KRPL is in process of responding to the notice appropriately to the Income Tax Department. Further, the Income tax department issued notices under section 142(1) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment year 2012-13 to 2018-19 to furnish certain details. The details called for are being furnished from time to time. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, KRPL

received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment years 2012-2013 to 2017-2018) and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, assessment year 2018-2019, for an aggregate refund of ₹ 54.15 million. KRPL has filed rectification applications and appeals which are pending before the relevant authority.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. For civil / commercial litigation involving KRPL, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Ravi C. Raheja – Material civil/commercial litigation” and “-Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Chandru L. Raheja – Material civil/commercial litigation”.

L. Palm Shelter

(i) Criminal matters

1. The Senior Police Inspector, Santacruz Police Station (“**Police Station**”) pursuant to a complaint dated April 21, 2016, filed by Claud Fernandez (“**Complainant**”) against certain third parties under Sections 420 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, had issued a letter dated July 20, 2016 to Palm Shelter Estate Development Private Limited (now Palm Shelter Estate Development LLP) (“**PSEDPL**”) to appear before the police station on July 23, 2017. Certain agreements were entered into between the Complainant, certain family members of the Complainant and PSEDPL, for the handover and re-development of four flats in a building property. The Complainant filed a suit before the Bombay City Civil Court, due to disputes arising between the family members and the Complainant, where PSEDPL was made a defendant to the suit. Consent terms were filed between the parties to the suit which allowed PSEDPL to develop the property. PSEDPL had later transferred its development rights along with all benefits and obligations in the property to Parvesh Constructions Private Limited. Authorized representatives of PSEDPL appeared before the Police Station to provide requested information and documents and filed their deposition on the matter. There has been no correspondence between the parties in the present matter. The matter is currently pending.

(ii) Regulatory actions

There are no pending regulatory actions against Palm Shelter.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. For civil / commercial litigation involving Palm Shelter, see “- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Ravi C. Raheja – Material civil/commercial litigation”.

In addition to the above pending proceedings, Mr. Ravi C. Raheja, Mr. Neel C. Raheja, Mr. Chandru L. Raheja, Genext, KRPL and KRCPL have been identified as parties in certain labour proceeding filed by certain trade unions before the labour courts and industrial courts/tribunals alleging unfair labour practices under the Maharashtra Recognition of Trade Unions and Prevention of Unfair Labour Practices Act, 1971 against certain workmen engaged by them. The matter is currently pending before the relevant courts/tribunals.

IV. MATERIAL LITIGATION AND REGULATORY ACTIONS PENDING AGAINST THE MANAGER

As of March 31, 2021, the Manager does not have any regulatory actions or criminal matters pending against it, or material civil/ commercial litigation pending against it. For the purposes of pending material civil/commercial litigation against the Manager, such matters where value exceeds 5% of the total revenue of the Manager as of March 31, 2021 have been considered material and proceedings where the amount is not determinable but the proceeding is considered material by the Manager have been considered.

V. MATERIAL LITIGATION AND REGULATORY ACTIONS PENDING AGAINST THE ASSOCIATES OF EACH OF MINDSPACE REIT, THE SPONSORS AND THE MANAGER, AND ENTITIES WHERE ANY OF THE SPONSORS HOLD ANY INTEREST/ SHAREHOLDING

As of March 31, 2021, the Associates of the Manager (to the extent that such Associates are not the Sponsor Group) and the Associates of the Sponsors (excluding members of the Sponsor Group) do not have any pending regulatory actions or criminal matters against them, or material civil/ commercial litigation pending against them.

With respect to the Associates of the Manager (to the extent that such Associates are not the Sponsor Group), the Associates of Mindspace REIT (to the extent that such Associates are not the Asset SPVs and members of the Sponsor Group), the Associates of the Sponsors (excluding members of the Sponsor Group) and entities where any of the Sponsors hold any interest/shareholding (excluding the Asset SPVs and members of the Sponsor Group), details of all pending criminal matters and regulatory actions against such entities and material civil/commercial litigation against such entities have been disclosed.

For the purpose of pending civil/ commercial litigation against such entities, such matters where value exceeds 1% of the total consolidated profit after tax of Mindspace REIT as of March 31, 2021 have been considered material and proceedings where the amount is not determinable but the proceeding is considered material by the Manager have been disclosed.

A. Chalet Hotels

(i) Criminal matters

1. Maria Ninitte Noronha (“**Complainant**”) lodged a first information report dated November 6, 2007 (“**FIR**”) against Prashant Gerald Nazereth, partner of Pebbledrops Events, on the grounds of forgery, cheating and dishonestly inducing delivery of property. Renaissance Mumbai Convention Centre Hotel received a notice dated October 12, 2007 from the Complainant claiming that the advance consideration amount of ₹ 1 million paid to the hotel by Pebbledrops Events was fraudulently obtained by Prashant Gerald Nazereth from her and further demanded it to be refunded. In pursuance of the FIR, Chalet Hotels was named as an accused in a final report prepared by the police. Chalet Hotels deposited ₹ 1 million with the Bandra police station pending conclusion of the trial. Subsequently, the Complainant filed an application in February 2008 before the Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Bandra (“**Metropolitan**”).

Court) for withdrawing the amount deposited by Chalet Hotels to which Chalet Hotels has filed its reply dated March 26, 2008, denying the claim. The matter is currently pending before the Metropolitan Court.

2. Hitesh Nandlal Ramani lodged a first information report dated December 14, 2015 at the Powai police station, Mumbai against one of Chalet Hotels' employee of its hotel, Renaissance Mumbai Convention Centre Hotel, and its swimming pool lifeguard, on the grounds of causing death by negligence and endangering life or personal safety of his daughter. The Powai police station has filed its final report dated November 25, 2016 before the Metropolitan Magistrate, Andheri ("**Metropolitan Court**"). The matter is currently pending before the Metropolitan Court.
3. The State of Maharashtra (Excise Department) filed proceedings before the Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Bandra ("**Metropolitan Court**") against Saumen S. Shah, representative of the guests, Kailash B. Pandit employee of Chalet Hotels' hotel, Renaissance Mumbai Convention Centre Hotel, and Shivkumar S. Verma a consultant, alleging service of liquor without adequate permission within the hotel premises on January 10, 2018. A writ petition has been filed before the Bombay High Court by Kailash Pandit for quashing the matter. The matter is currently pending before the Bombay High Court.
4. Abhimanyu Rishi lodged a first information report dated May 3, 2008 at the Powai police station, Mumbai against Prashant More, an employee of one of Chalet Hotels' hotel, Renaissance Mumbai Convention Centre Hotel and other employees on alleging assault and injury by hotel staff. The Powai police station has filed its final report dated April 21, 2009 before the Andheri Metropolitan Magistrate Court ("**Court**"). The matter is currently pending before the Court.
5. Mohammad Altaf Abdul Latif Sayyed lodged a first information report dated May 15, 2018 with the Powai police station, Mumbai against two of the employees of one of Chalet Hotels' hotel, Renaissance Mumbai Convention Centre Hotel alleging theft of his personal property. The matter is being investigated by the police and there has been no further correspondence or update on same.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Chalet Hotels and others. For details, see "Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions". Chalet Hotels received a notice dated November 27, 2018 from the Income Tax Department in relation to certain transactions entered into by certain KRC group persons, including Chalet Hotels. For details, see "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – MBPPL – Regulatory Actions". Further, Chalet Hotels has received notice dated December 9, 2019 under Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, to file its income tax return for assessment year 2008-09 within five days from

the date of service of notice and the return has been filed with the Income Tax Department. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Chalet Hotels received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment years 2008-2009, 2012-2013 to 2017-2018) and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, assessment year 2018-2019 for an aggregate refund of ₹ 80.38 million. Chalet Hotels has filed rectification applications and appeals which are pending before the relevant authority. Certain rectification applications have been processed by the relevant authority increasing the aggregate refund to ₹ 224.50 million.

2. The Directorate General of Goods and Service Tax Intelligence Pune Zonal Unit ("**DG**") has issued a notice dated June 15, 2018 addressed to Chalet Hotels in relation to an investigation being conducted by the DG in respect of alleged evasion of service tax by M/s Starwood Hotels & Resorts India Private Limited, Gurgaon, operator of The Westin Hyderabad Mindspace Hotel. Chalet Hotels submitted letter dated March 22, 2019 to the DG. No further correspondence has been received.
3. The Directorate of Revenue Intelligence issued a show cause notice dated November 29, 2018 ("**DRI Show Cause Notice**") directing Chalet Hotels to show cause as to why duty amounting to ₹ 195.18 million and ₹ 23.14 million should not be recovered in relation to import of goods against SFIS Scrip/License and the post-export service benefits availed by Chalet Hotels. Chalet Hotels filed a writ petition dated December 24, 2018 before the Gujarat High Court challenging DRI Show Cause Notice. The Gujarat High Court through an ex-parte interim order stayed the effect of the DRI Show Cause Notice. The Gujarat High Court, by its order dated March 2, 2020, dismissed the writ petition, on the basis of the statement recorded on behalf of DRI that DRI shall not proceed further with the DRI Show Cause Notice till the SFIS Scrips are held to be invalid or put under suspension. Further, pursuant to directives under the DRI Show Cause Notice, show cause notice dated July 4, 2019 was issued by CGST & Central Excise Division, Bhopal in relation to utilization of SFIS benefits by Chalet Hotels for purchase of glass and a demand to make payment of excise duty of ₹ 0.3 million. Replies on behalf of Chalet Hotels and a former director of Chalet Hotels, have been submitted on September 23, 2020 with CGST & Central Excise Division, Bhopal. The matter is currently pending.
4. Chalet Hotels received a notice from the MCGM dated December 7, 2018 in relation to alleged misuse of the municipal recreation ground by JW Marriott Mumbai Sahar. Chalet Hotels replied to the notice on December 19, 2018 informing MCGM of its proposal to hand over 20% of the recreation ground to the MCGM in terms of Development Control & Promotion Regulations 2034 for Greater Mumbai. Further, Chalet Hotels received MCGM approval on May 7, 2019 and April 9, 2019 for its proposal in relation to the recreational ground. The formal handover of the recreation ground is in process. Chalet Hotels received further correspondence from the MCGM alleging misuse of the municipal recreation ground by JW Marriott Mumbai Sahar which Chalet Hotels has denied.

5. A demand notice dated February 9, 2018 has been issued by the Tehsildar Thane, addressed to the guest (event organizer) and one of Chalet Hotels' hotel i.e. Four Points by Sheraton Navi Mumbai, Vashi demanding the payment of ₹ 0.40 million (inclusive of interest) as entertainment tax. Chalet Hotels has replied vide letter dated April 24, 2018 denying the claim and have provided the supporting documents. No further correspondence has been received.
 6. A demand notice dated December 19, 2016 was issued by the Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagar Pallike ("BBMP") addressed to Magna, now merged into Chalet Hotels, demanding payment of amount aggregating ₹ 256.78 million towards outstanding property tax for the period 2008-2009 to 2015-2016 (inclusive of interest/penalty). Magna vide reply dated January 1, 2017 denied the claim of BBMP. No further correspondence has been received.
 7. A notice dated February 8, 2018 was issued by the Central Bureau of Investigation (Bank Security and Fraud Cell) ("CBI") addressed to Magna, now merged into Chalet Hotels, calling upon Magna to produce certain documents and information required and to appear in person, in the case bearing no. RC 10(E)/2017 dated July 27, 2017, filed by CBI against Shiva Kumar Reddy director of Kaveri Telecom Infrastructure Limited and others. Chalet Hotels has appropriately responded to CBI. No further correspondence has been received.
 8. A show cause notice dated August 9, 2017 has been issued by the Director General of Foreign Trade imposing a penalty with interest on Magna, now merged into Chalet Hotels, for failing to return the terminal excise duty refund for ₹ 0.17 million. Chalet Hotels has filed its reply denying the alleged liability. No further correspondence has been received.
 9. MCGM has issued a stop work notice dated June 4, 2018 addressed to Chalet Hotels in respect of alleged unlawful development and construction in Andheri, Mumbai. Chalet Hotels has issued a reply dated June 6, 2018 to the MCGM denying their claims and have submitted the requisite documents along with the reply. No further correspondence has been received.
 10. The Office of Additional Director General of Foreign Trade issued certain recovery notices for the recovery benefits granted, aggregating to ₹ 9.10 million ("**Impugned Recovery Notices**") on the basis that Magna, which has now merged with Chalet Hotels is ineligible to avail the benefits under the Served From India Scheme which were granted earlier to Magna. A writ petition was filed before the Karnataka High Court at Bengaluru ("**Court**") challenging the Impugned Recovery Notices. The Court has granted a stay on the impugned recovery notices and the matter is currently pending before the Court.
 11. The Regional Provident Fund Commissioner had passed an order dated December 14, 2012 ("**Order**") on the basis of guidance issued by the Central Board of Trustees, Employees Provident Fund Organization in relation to certain dues of the employees of its hotel i.e. Renaissance Mumbai Convention Centre Hotel aggregating ₹ 3.77 million assessed by the Petitioner as payable by Chalet Hotels. Chalet Hotels filed an appeal before the Employees Provident Fund Appellate Tribunal, New Delhi ("**Tribunal**") challenging the Order which was set aside by the Tribunal on July 21, 2014. Aggrieved, the Central Board of Trustees, Employees Provident Fund Organization filed a writ petition before the Bombay High Court, against Chalet Hotels, challenging an order of the Tribunal. The matter is currently pending before the Bombay High Court.
 12. The CIDCO issued an order dated December 1, 2014, directing KRCPL to discontinue use of a plot in Vashi ("**Open Space**") and vacate the land under Open Space, being used as entry and exit points for Four Points by Sheraton Navi Mumbai, Vashi, and residential apartment ("**Hotel**") of Chalet Hotels and Inorbit Malls, on the ground that it does not form part of the allotment by CIDCO to the KRCPL and the permission given vide CIDCO letter dated October 6, 2004 was given without due authority. Aggrieved, KRCPL filed a writ petition before the Bombay High Court ("**Court**"). The Court vide its order dated January 16, 2015 directed both parties to maintain status quo. The matter is currently pending before the Court.
 13. The Director of Revenue Intelligence has issued an investigation notice dated January 22, 2020 to Chalet Hotels, requiring Chalet Hotels to furnish information and documents relating to SEIS scrips for the financial year 2016-17 till date. Through its reply dated January 27, 2020, Chalet Hotels has submitted the requisite information and documents. No further correspondence has been received.
 14. The Office of the Principal Commissioner of Customs Airport & Air Cargo Complex, Bengaluru issued an order dated July 16, 2020 (received on December 24, 2020) ("**Order**") against Magna Warehousing & Distribution Private Limited ("**Magna**") to enforce a bond amounting to ₹ 2.5 million along with interest on the alleged ground that Magna failed to (i) fulfil export obligations within 18 months from the date of issue of license, (ii) earn the foreign exchange within the specified time period as per Foreign Trade Policy 2009-14, and (iii) produce export obligation discharge certificate. Chalet Hotels is in the processing of submitting its response to the Order.
 15. For other regulatory actions against Chalet Hotels, see "Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – KRIT– Regulatory actions" and "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – Mr. Ravi C. Raheja – Regulatory Actions".
- (iii) **Material civil/commercial litigation**
1. Chalet Hotels filed a writ petition ("**Writ Petition**") before the Karnataka High Court at Bengaluru ("**Court**") challenging the cancellation of the height NOC dated October 28, 2011 issued in relation to a residential building ("**NOC**") by Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd. ("**HAL**"), responsible for issuing the height NOC and for directing HAL to permit construction up to maximum height which does not adversely affect aircraft operations as may be determined by an aeronautical study to be conducted by Airport Authority of India /ICAO, and ancillary reliefs

(including an amended relief for re-validating the NOC for a further period). The NOC was issued for the development of a 17 floor residential building complex with a height of up to 62 meters on Chalet Hotels' land at Koramangala Industrial Layout, Bengaluru. At the time of cancellation of the NOC, five wings with 17 floors had been constructed with a height of up to 62 meters and more than 200 flats therein had been marketed by Chalet Hotels. The Court passed an interim order dated October 23, 2013 ("**Interim Order**") restricting Chalet Hotels from modifying and developing the building above 40 meters from ground level and selling premises to third parties in respect of any portion of the building above 40 meters. Several customers of Chalet Hotels, as also certain neighbouring residents, have got themselves impleaded as Respondents in the Writ Petition.

By a subsequent detailed judgement and order dated July 31, 2014 ("**Order**"), the Court directed the aeronautical study to be conducted by Airport Authority of India ("**AAI**"). HAL's writ appeal to challenge the Order was dismissed by the Division Bench of the Court on September 3, 2015 inter alia with a direction for expediting the hearing of the writ petition and to decide the matter uninfluenced by the observations in the Order. By a further order dated November 5, 2015, the Court clarified that the aeronautical study was to be carried out in accordance with the notified parameters of HAL Airport and Notification SO 84(E) dated January 14, 2010. Accordingly, AAI conducted the study and filed its report on January 27, 2016, in effect confirming that the full height of the then completed building-wings was permissible as it does not adversely affect aircraft operations. HAL has filed objections to the aeronautical study report of AAI, inter alia alleging that it is a unique defence airport carrying out test flying. Chalet Hotels has also inter alia submitted that it had no motive or any additional area to gain, as the project has sufficient land to absorb and construct the entire FAR sanctioned for 17 floors -62 meters in a horizontal structure of 10 floors - 40 meters.

By judgement and order dated May 29, 2020, the Court disposed of the Writ Petition, inter alia allowing the Writ Petition in part and quashed the cancellation of the height NOC by HAL (in so far as cancellation of NOC for construction upto 62 meters above ground level, so that the top of the structure when erected shall not exceed 932 meters Above Mean Sea Level ("**AMSL**"), and remanding the matter to HAL for re-survey of site AMSL within a time bound manner; and thereafter based on the re-survey report, proceed further in accordance with law. Further, HAL has been prohibited from taking any precipitative action, and Chalet Hotels has been prohibited from putting further construction and modifying/ altering or selling or agreeing to sell or entering into agreements with third parties in respect of any portion of building/ property. The Court rejected as premature, the prayers for permitting Chalet Hotels to construct upto a height which does not adversely affect aircraft operations (as determined by an aeronautical study) and to revalidate the NOC for a further period of 5 years; and granted liberty to the Company to file necessary application at the appropriate time, keeping all contentions with regard to aeronautical study open. In relation to the said order, HAL filed a caveat and also an appeal. Chalet Hotels has

also filed an appeal on November 26, 2020. Both appeals are pending before the court.

Further, certain communications were also exchanged between HAL and Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike ("**BBMP**") and Chalet Hotels between 2013 and 2017, wherein Chalet Hotels inter alia updated BBMP regarding the writ petition and furnished an undertaking to BBMP not to make a further vertical expansion / modification, alteration or development above 40 meters. Chalet Hotels vide letter dated January 16, 2017 requested BBMP for an extension of the validity period of the building sanction plan for the project.

Regarding its customers, Chalet Hotels had executed MoUs for a provisional reservation of a right to purchase various apartments, providing them with an option right; as also executed and registered agreements for sale with a few customers. The issue relating to NOC cancellation by HAL has been the subject of various communications between Chalet Hotels and the customers from inception till date, including a mitigation program which was continued up to December 31, 2020. Some customers have exited the project, and continuing customers are being paid goodwill compensation pursuant to the mitigation program. Subsequent to the COVID-19 pandemic, few customers have requested for exit and/ or sought details of amounts payable to them on exit. As a matter of abundant caution, Chalet Hotels had also registered the project under RERA on a without prejudice basis.

Chalet Hotels is having without prejudice discussions with the existing customers for their consent to a revised development proposal inter alia by addition of a residential wing and an independent commercial building, and limiting the height of all buildings up to 40 mtrs; which will be subject to modification orders from the court and obtainment of HAL's approval. Chalet Hotels has also filed certain without prejudice applications with the authorities for processing of certain approvals relating to the proposed revised development.

2. Iris Trout has filed a suit against Marriott International Inc., Marriott Hotels India Private Limited, Chalet Hotels, KRCPL and certain other defendants in the Superior Court of Middlesex County, New Jersey, USA on November 5, 2018 for failure to maintain premises in a safe condition resulting in personal injury at The Westin Hyderabad Mindspace Hotel. The matter is currently pending before the Superior Court of Middlesex County, New Jersey, USA. A settlement demand from Iris Trout for an amount of \$1.35 million has been received. On January 29, 2021, the matter was mediated and settled between Iris Trout and AIG (insurance company) for \$900,000. The release document has been signed by Iris Trout and her husband Peter Trout on March 1, 2021, pursuant to which the payment has been released by AIG on March 22, 2021. The Application for dismissal of the suit is in the process of being filed.
3. For other details material civil/ commercial litigation against Chalet Hotels, see "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Sponsor Group – KRCPL – Material civil/commercial litigation".

B. JT Holdings

(i) Criminal matters

There are no pending criminal matters against JT Holdings.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. Development Commissioner, Visakhapatnam SEZ, Government of India, Hyderabad (“**Development Commissioner**”) has issued a show cause notice dated February 9, 2018 to JT Holdings for non-compliance of certain provisions of the Special Economic Zones Rules, 2006 (“**SEZ Rules**”) pertaining to construction of minimum up area specified in the under the SEZ Rules within a period of ten years from the date of notification of a SEZ and the Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act, 1992 (“**FTDR Act**”). JT Holdings has replied to the show cause notice denying any default under the FTDR Act. No further correspondence has been received.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. Campaign for Housing & Tenurial Rights (CHATRI) has filed a writ petition against the Government of Andhra Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh Industrial Infrastructure Corporation (now known as Telangana State Industrial Infrastructure Corporation), Hyderabad Urban Development Authority, the Andhra Pradesh Housing Board, JT Holdings, Stargaze and others (“**Respondents**”) before the Andhra Pradesh High Court (now known as Telangana High Court) for declaring the allotment of forest land by the Government of Andhra Pradesh and certain other Respondents as unconstitutional and illegal and has sought the review all the allotments of land made by the Government of Andhra Pradesh and certain other Respondents in the last 10 years by way of sale/lease. The matter is currently pending before the Telangana High Court.
2. Forum for a Better Hyderabad has filed a writ petition against the Government of India, Ministry of Environment & Forest, JT Holdings, Stargaze and others (“**Respondents**”) before the Andhra Pradesh High Court (now known as Telangana High Court) for declaring the action of the Government of India, Ministry of Environment & Forest and certain other Respondents in diverting forest land in violation of the provisions of the Constitution of India, Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 the Forest Act, 1980 and Wildlife Protection Act 1972, among others. The matter is currently pending before the Telangana High Court.
3. The Office of the Land Reforms Tribunal Cum Deputy Collector & Revenue Divisional Officer, Ranga Reddy East Division (“**Tribunal**”) had, by letter dated August 11, 2009, sought certain information from JT Holdings under Section 8(2) of the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agriculture Holdings) Act, 1973 (“**APLRAC**”) in respect of its land at Raviryal Village. JT Holdings has filed a detailed response stating that the land was granted by APIIC (who had acquired the property from the Government of Andhra Pradesh), and been declared as an SEZ; and is therefore not “land” covered under the APLRAC. The authorized officer filed counter dated April 10, 2012 and JT Holdings filed a rejoinder on September 10, 2012. JT Holdings also submitted a copy of the order dated August 9, 2012,

which was passed by the Hon’ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh (“**High Court**”) in a similar matter (being Writ Petition No. 19300/2012 filed by Neogen Properties Pvt. Ltd.) whereas a stay was granted by the High Court until further orders. The matter is currently pending before the Land Reforms Tribunal cum Revenue Divisional Officer, Ranga Reddy East Division.

C. Shoppers Stop

(i) Criminal matters

There are no pending criminal matters against Shoppers Stop.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Shoppers Stop and others. For details, see “Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions”. Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Shoppers Stop received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for assessment years 2012-2013 to 2017-2018 and under Section 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, assessment year 2018-2019, for an aggregate demand of ₹ 102.06 million. Shoppers Stop has filed rectification applications and appeals which are pending before the relevant authority.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. South Delhi Municipal Corporation (“**SDMC**”) conducted an inspection on April 10, 2017 and sent a demand notice to Shoppers Stop demanding ₹ 0.74 million per month towards damages for putting on advertisement without any permission from the competent authority (“**Notice**”). Shoppers Stop filed a writ petition before the Delhi High Court (“**Court**”) against the Notice. The Court disposed of the writ petition and directed SDMC to consider the representation of Shoppers Stop for deciding the matter. The demand of ₹ 0.74 million per month was subsequently affirmed by SDMC, pursuant to which Shoppers Stop filed another writ petition before the Court. The Court passed an order on February 18, 2015 in favour of Shoppers Stop on grounds that SDMC did not have jurisdiction to demand damages. Aggrieved by the order, SDMC has filed a special leave petition before the Supreme Court of India. The matter is current pending before the Supreme Court of India.
2. Shoppers Stop has filed a special leave petition before the Supreme Court of India against the Union of India (“**Respondent**”) challenging Section 65(90a) of the Finance Act, 1994, whereby, the Government of India has notified the activity of leasing being a service and consequently making it amenable to levy of service tax, resulting in arrears of service tax of approximately ₹ 360 million. The Supreme Court of India, in its interim order dated October 14, 2011, has directed Shoppers Stop to deposit 50 % of the arrears towards service tax and furnished surety for the balance 50%. Shoppers Stop has deposited the entire arrears under protest. The matter is currently pending before the Supreme Court of India.

D. Stargaze**(i) Criminal matters**

There are no pending criminal matters against Stargaze.

(ii) Regulatory actions

1. The Income Tax Department had issued a warrant dated November 29, 2017 under Section 132 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against Stargaze and others. For details, see "Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against Mindspace REIT and the Asset SPVs – Avacado – Regulatory Actions". Pursuant to the block assessment proceedings, Stargaze received orders under Section 143(3) read with Section 153A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 for the assessment years of block assessment period (ranging from assessment years 2012-2013 to 2017-2018), for an aggregate refund of ₹ 0.02 million. Stargaze has filed rectification applications which are pending before the relevant authority. The assessment proceeding for the assessment year 2018-2019 is ongoing.

2. Development Commissioner, Visakhapatnam SEZ, Government of India, Hyderabad ("**Development Commissioner**") has issued a show cause notice dated February 9, 2018 to Stargaze for non-compliance of certain provisions of the Special Economic Zones Rules, 2006 ("**SEZ Rules**") pertaining to construction of minimum built-up area specified in the under the SEZ Rules within a period of ten years from the date of notification of a SEZ and the Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act, 1992 ("**FTDR Act**"). The Development Commissioner has sought to take action against Stargaze. Stargaze has replied to the show cause notice denying any default under the FTDR Act. No Further correspondence has been received.

(iii) Material civil/commercial litigation

1. For other pending material civil/commercial litigation against Stargaze, see "- Material litigation and regulatory actions pending against the Associates of the Sponsors - JT Holdings - Material civil/commercial litigation".

2. The Office of the Land Reforms Tribunal Cum Deputy Collector & Revenue Divisional Officer, Ranga Reddy East Division ("**Tribunal**") had, by letter dated August 11, 2009, sought certain information from Stargaze under Section 8(2) of the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agriculture Holdings) Act, 1973 ("**APLRAC**") in respect of its land at Raviryal Village. Stargaze has filed a detailed response stating that the land was granted by APIIC (who had acquired the property from the Government of Andhra Pradesh), and 170.40 out of 250 acres been declared as an SEZ; and is therefore not "land" covered under the APLRAC. The authorized officer filed counter dated July 23, 2012 and Stargaze filed rejoinder dated August 29, 2012. Stargaze also submitted a copy of the order dated August 9, 2012, which was passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh ("**High Court**") in a similar matter (being Writ Petition No. 19300/2012 filed by Neogen Properties Pvt. Ltd.) whereas a stay was granted by the High Court until further orders. The matter is currently pending before the Land Reforms Tribunal cum Revenue Divisional Officer, Ranga Reddy East Division.

In addition to the above pending proceedings, Chalet Hotels has been identified as a party in seven separate labour proceedings filed by certain trade unions and employees before the labour /industrial courts and high court in Mumbai alleging unfair labour practices under the Maharashtra Recognition of Trade Unions and Prevention of Unfair Labour Practices Act, 1971, for failure to assign certain workers at its project, recognition of trade unions and termination of services. The matters are currently pending before the relevant courts.

VI. MATERIAL LITIGATION AND REGULATORY ACTIONS PENDING AGAINST THE TRUSTEE

As of March 31, 2021, the Trustee does not have any pending regulatory actions, criminal matters or material civil/commercial litigation pending against it. For the purpose of pending material civil/ commercial litigation against the Trustee, matters involving amounts exceeding 5% of the profit after tax of the Trustee for Financial Year 2021 have been considered material.

VII. TAX PROCEEDINGS

As on March 31, 2021, there are no direct, indirect or property tax matters against the Sponsors, the Manager and the Trustee. Details of all direct tax, indirect tax and property tax matters against the Relevant Parties (other than the Sponsors and the Manager), as of March 31, 2021 is set forth:

Nature of case	Number of cases	Amount involved (in ₹ million) (to the extent quantifiable)
Mindspace REIT and Asset SPVs		
Direct tax	29	952.79
Indirect tax	23	1,837.13
Property tax	1	0.26
Total	53	2,790.18
Sponsor Group (excluding the Sponsors)		
Direct tax	27	1,511.80
Indirect tax	3	221.01
Property tax	10	71.57
Total	40	1,804.38

Nature of case	Number of cases	Amount involved (in ₹ million) (to the extent quantifiable)
Associates of Mindspace REIT (excluding the Asset SPVs), Associates of the Sponsors (excluding the Manager, the Asset SPVs, their respective Associates and the Sponsor Group), Associates of the Manager (to the extent that such Associates are not the Sponsor Group) and entities where any of the Sponsors hold any interest/shareholding		
Direct tax	21	2,217.58
Indirect tax	20	671.01
Property tax	4	440.17
Total	45	3,328.76

Notes:

The direct tax matters are primarily in the nature of demand notices and/or orders issued by the income tax authorities alleging non/short deduction of TDS, computation of taxable income on account of certain additions/disallowances, deduction of tax incentive and classifications of income resulting in additional demand of TDS/income tax. Such matters are pending at the relevant appellate authorities including income tax appellate tribunals and high courts.

The indirect tax matters are primarily in the nature of demand notices and/or orders issued by indirect tax authorities alleging irregularities in payment of indirect taxes on identified transactions, irregular availment of CENVAT credit of service tax and mismatch in turnover reported in service tax returns vis-à-vis income tax returns. Such matters are pending before different indirect tax authorities and courts, including indirect tax appellate tribunals.

The Asset SPVs, the Sponsor Group and Associates of Sponsors (excluding the Sponsors Group) and entities where any of the Sponsors hold any interest/shareholding (excluding the Asset SPVs and members of the Sponsor Group), have, with an intention to settle some of the service tax disputes and avail the benefit of reduced tax liability, interest and penalty waiver, opted for the Sabka Vishwas (Legacy Dispute Resolution) Scheme, 2019. In some instances, the applications have been rejected by the authorities and some of the entities have filed, or in the process of filing, writ petitions before Bombay High Court in relation to such matters. Some of the Asset

SPVs, Sponsor Group and Associates of Sponsors (excluding the Sponsor Group) with the intention to settle income tax disputes and avail the benefit of interest and penalty waiver, have made applications under Direct Tax Vivad se Vishwas Act, 2020. In some instances, the applications have been accepted by the authorities and the disputes have been settled.

In addition to the above, the Asset SPVs, the Sponsor Group and Associates of Sponsors (excluding the Sponsors Group) and entities where any of the Sponsors hold any interest/shareholding (excluding the Asset SPVs and members of the Sponsor Group), are in receipt of notices, intimations, letters, enquiries, etc., in connection with the assessment (regular, best judgment, scrutiny, etc.) procedures prescribed under the applicable indirect tax legislations (state value added tax and entry tax legislations, central sales tax, the Finance Act 1994, customs legislation) and Income Tax Act, 1961 read with the relevant rules and regulations prescribed thereunder. All requisite information, records, documents, returns, payment challans, submissions and declarations sought by the tax authorities have been provided from time to time. As of the date of this Final Offer Document, the assessment proceedings are pending finalization.

Amount involved in connection with tax proceedings includes, in addition to the tax/duty demanded, the penalty levied under the direct and indirect tax laws to the extent explicitly quantified. Interest has not been included.