

TOWN PLANNING SCHEME, NAINA NO. 06

(Part of Villages of Chikhale, Moho, Pali Khurd, Shivkar)

PRELIMINARY SCHEME

(Under Section 72(4) and Rule 13 (5) & (6))

Table A


Original Plot-wise Decisions of the Arbitrator

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Vijaya Sadan Co-Op Housing Society, P.M.P Kurup Chief Promoter, AV Poulosse, P. G. Nair, K. S. Unnithan	Chikhale	137/1/A/1/2/3	Class I	18	1651	2	5212.028	5212.028	They appeared for a hearing on 02.05.2023 and submitted their representation dated 23.06.23. Submission in representation: 1.) Vijaya Sadan Co-op Society was registered on 03.05.1991. Collector, Alibaug sanctioned layout and NA permission on their land bearing survey no. 144/1, 2, 3, 145/1/2/3, 137/1, 146/1, 147/1, Chikhale. 2.) Out of the abovementioned land, only Survey No. 137/1 has been included in the TPS -6 and 5 existing residential buildings are in the said land. 3.) In TPS - 6, 45 M wide road is proposed through the said survey no. 137/1 and thereby affecting the society's land measuring 788 sq. m. Remaining 5212 sq. m. land has been shown under the final plot of TPS - 6 and Rs. 2.92 Crore has been charged as betterment charges. 4.) The society requested to exclude their land from TPS - 6 and for the land under the proposed road, compensation shall be granted in line with the Samrudhhi Highway.	The part area of the society bearing Gut no. 137/1/A/1 to 7 included in the sanctioned draft scheme. It is affected by 45 mt. wide Interim Development Plan (IDP) road and the remaining area has been granted Final Plot No. 2. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to the condition that for any further development, the said Final Plot no. 2 shall be considered in combination with the adjoining land of the society bearing Gut no. 144/1,2,3, 145/1/2/3, 146/1, 147/1, Chikhale. Final Plot No. 2, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
2		Chikhale	137/1/A/4/6/7		19	1704					
3		Chikhale	137/1/A/5		20	2645					
4		Chikhale	137/1/B		21	6000	3	2400	2400		In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no. 3A has been proposed in their original holding bearing survey no. 137/1/B. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the final plot no as 3A. Final Plot No. 3A, as shown in plan no



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										3.) They do not agree with 60 -40 % ratio of the original holding, and does not wish to include their land in NAINA, TPS -6.	4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
5	Dattatreya Damodar Patankar, Satyajit Suresh Patil, Sangeeta Rajendra Patil	Chikhale	137/3	Class I	23	3200	3A	1280	1280	They appeared for a hearing on 30.05.2023 and also submitted their representation. Submission in hearing - 1) Their property bearing survey no. 137/3 is a collector NA plot and they have constructed a residential bungalow therein. 2) The said NAINA TPS No. 06 is not accepted by them and requested to delete their original plot no. 23 from the said scheme. 3.) Mrs. Sangeeta Rajendra Patil wide Gift Deed dated 2 July 2013, has gifted her share in survey no. 137/3 admeasuring 1200sq. m to Mrs. Kamal Alias Sushma Suresh Patil. Therefore in the ownership record of FP no. 3A, the name of Mrs. Sangeeta Rajendra Patil shall be deleted and the name of Mrs. Kamal Alias Sushma Suresh Patil shall be inserted.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 3B has been proposed in their original holding bearing survey no. 137/3, around their structure. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and change in the final plot no as 3B. Final Plot No. 3B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
6	P.M.P. Kurup Chief Promoter, Vanshree Co-op-housing Society.	Chikhale	143/2	Class I	48	5400	5	2160	2160	They have neither appeared for hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 5, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
7	Indirabai Prabhakar Behere, Ramchandra Prabhakar Behere,	Chikhale	142/1	Class I	42	5900	6	2360	4240	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed subject to correction in the name of the owners as per the updated 7/12 extract, Final Plot No. 6, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
8	Arvind Prabhakar Behere, Madhuvati Madhusudan Joshi, Vinaya Ashok Kelkar, Supriya Shrikant Soman, Suniti Sadanand Bapat, Vaishali Ashok Velankar	Chikhale	143/1		47	4700		1880			
9	Gramast Devi Parlit Vahivatdar, Dattatreya Damodar Patankar	Chikhale	142/5	Class I	46	3400	7	1360	1360	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 7, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
10	Rehab Housing Pvt. Ltd.	Chikhale	142/3	Class I	44	1000	8	400	1000	They appeared for a hearing on 30.05.2023 and submitted their representation at the time of the hearing and thereafter additional representation on 19/6/2023. Submission 1) Rehab Housing Pvt. Ltd. Own Gut No. 139/2, 138/1A, 142/3, 142/4 in	In the other right column of the 7/12 extract of Gut no 138/1A, it was mentioned as "kulkayada kalam 63a -1 chya tartudis adhin kharedi- vikris pratibandh". Therefore as per their request, their original lands bearing Gut
11		Chikhale	142/4		45	1500		600			


Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										Chikhale and Falguni Patel, who is their family member, owns Gut No. 81/0 in Shivkar Village. Earlier, with the consent letter dated 09.11.2020, they had given consent to provide them with a single final plot in the scheme. However, the company has been allotted Final plots no. 8 & 94 and Falguni Patel has been allocated Final plot no. 568 at different locations, therefore they contended that it will lead to hardship in planning and its financial viability, 2.) Civil Suit No. 675/2011 has been disposed of and accordingly wide mutation no. 3598, the entry of "litigation under civil suit no. 675/2011" in the 7/12 extract of Gut No. 142/3 and 142/4 has been deleted. Also, all the lands are under occupancy class I 3.) Therefore they requested to grant one combined final plot in the joint name of the company and Falguni Patel.	no. 142/3, 142/4, 139/2, and 81 pt are clubbed together and combined Final Plot no.91 has been granted. For Gut no. 138/1A, Final plot no.94 has been granted. Accordingly Final Plot Nos. 91 & 94, as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
12	Sitaram Dharma Chaudhary, Govind Dharma Chaudhary, Janardan Dharma Chaudhary, Laxman Dharma Chaudhary, Parvati Nathu Patil, Sitabai Rama Hathmode, Anandi Vasant Kadav	Chikhale	139/3	Class II	30	2000	9	800	800	Shri. Shrinath Sitaram Choudhary and Shri. Rajannath Janardhan Choudhary appeared for a hearing on 25.10.23. Submission in hearing - 1.) They do not accept the allotted Final Plot. 2.) The raised an objection regarding the NAINA TPS Scheme.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners, as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 9, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
13	M/s Deep Jyot Enterprises	Chikhale	142/2	Class I	43	3700	10	1480	1480	They appeared for a hearing on 02.05.2023 and submitted the following points. Submission in hearing- 1.) They accepted the reconstituted final plot as per the draft scheme. 2.) They shall be totally exempted from paying the contribution charges as prescribed in Form 1.	The objection regarding contribution charges will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the final plot no. as 10A Final Plot no. 10A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
14	Madhusudan Ganesh Ghangrekar, Padmakar Ganesh Ghangrekar, Amol Shrikar Ghangrekar, Aditya Shrikar Ghangrekar, Amit Sudhakar Ghangrekar, Anoop Sudhakar	Chikhale	141/2	Class I	41	9500	15	3800	3800	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners, as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 15, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Ghangrekar, Madhavi Sudhakar Ghangrekar										
15	Arvind Shriram Aru, Pramod Rajaram Lad, Vishwas Rajaram Dudhgaonkar, Chandrakant Janakuram Gawli, Surekha Jaywant Dhamal, Ravikant Madhukar Jadhav, Eknath Shridhar Dhuri, Krishna Dattaram Koyande, Chandrakant Sopanrao Jadhav, Asha Lakshman Gaikwad	Chikhale	140/5	Class I	38	1500	16	600	600	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 16, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
16	Gargee Sunil Chauhan, Sunil Shantaram Chauhan	Chikhale	137/4	Class I	24	1100	17	440	440	They appeared for a hearing on 16.05.2023 and submitted their representation. 1) Submission in representation: The NAINA project is not accepted by them and therefore requested to delete their land bearing survey no. 137/4, Chikhale from NAINA TPS No. 06. 2) Submission during the hearing: The existing house in their original land shall be retained for them.	The applicant was informed to submit the document regarding the sanctioned permission of their existing house. They, wide letter dated 15.11.2023 informed that they had taken the permission from Chikhale Grampanchayat on 13.11.1997 and completed their structure in 2005. As per section 18 of MR & TP Act, any development in respect of any land situated in sanctioned Regional Plan area, shall require prior permission of the Collector of the District. The applicant has not submitted the sanctioned development permission of the Collector, Raigad. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 17, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
17	Eknath Undrya Gaykar, Kana Undrya Gaykar, Gunabai Balaram Patil, Sunita Dashrath Batale, Vanita Undrya Gaykar, Manjubai Undrya Gaykar	Chikhale	130/2	Class II	6	600	18	240	240	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed subject to change in the name of the owners, as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 18, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
18	Lakshmibai Balu Mhatre, Bhavna Bhaskar Mhatre, Bhavika Bhaskar Mhatre,	Chikhale	141/1/B	Class II	40	3760	19	1504	1504	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners, as per the updated



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Dhanashri Bhaskar Mhatre, Jayashree Gajanan Patil, Sheela Kisan Chorghhe, Pratibha Surendra Patil, Sr.No.3 and 4 Guardian Mother Bhavna										7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 19, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
19	Balaram Dharma Patil, Bhagwan Dharma Patil	Chikhale	141/1/A	Class I	39	7740	20	3096	3096	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 20, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
20	Baby Gajanan Mhatre	Chikhale	139/5	Class I	32	1000	21	400	400	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 21, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
21	Protect Forest	Shivkar	55	सरकार	76	80900	23A, 23B, 23C, 23D	73435.94	73435.94	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the area as per the boundary measurement. Final Plot nos. 23A, 23B, 23C & 23D, as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
22	Protect Forest	Shivkar	59	सरकार	81	48000	26	51470.56 3	51470.563	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot nos. 26, as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B..
23	Namdev Rama Tupe, Kathor Rama Tupe, Tukaram Rama Tupe, Nirmala Balu Patil, Shanti Shalik Mali, Dharmi Gotiram Dhavale, Yamuna Dharma Thombare	Shivkar	53	Class II	73	7540	28	3016	3016	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 28, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
24	Janardan Parshuram Pathe, Santosh Parshuram Pathe	Moho	105/4	Class I	517	5000	29	2000	2000	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed subject to change in the name of the owners, as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 29, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
25	Ramesh Aatmaram Dhavale, Pundalik Aatmaram Dhavale	Shivkar	43	Class II	59	3970	30	1588	1588	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 30, as shown in plan no 4,



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
26	Grand Developers tarfe Partner, Ismail Javed Patel, Javed Mustafa Patel, Fakari Hasamvala, Sandeep Raghunath Dige	Moho	105/3	Class I	516	2500	31	1000	1680	They appeared for a hearing on 12.06.2023 Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	By considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 31, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
27	Javed M. Patel, Ismail J. Patel, Fakari A. Hasamvala	Moho	107/3		524	1700		680			
28	Jhumarlal Motilal Bhalgat	Moho	109/4/2	Class I	528	1500	34	600	600	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 34, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
29	Maruti Aalya Patil	Moho	105/2	Class I	515	2500	35	1000	1000	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 35, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
30	Padmakar Dhau Dhavale, Sadashiv Dhau Dhavale, Bhalchandra Dhau Dhavale	Moho	107/5	Class II	526	3600	36	1440	1440	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 36, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
31	Shankar Kalu Mhatre	Moho	107/4	Class II	525	3200	37	1280	3588	Smt. Kavita Pundalik Mhatre appeared for hearing on 23.06.2023 and submitted their representation. Submission in representation and during the hearing: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in the NAINA Scheme. 2.) The NAINA project is not accepted by them and therefore requested to delete their land bearing survey no. 107/4, 118/2/1, 125/1/C, Moho from NAINA TPS No. 06.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 37 has been proposed in part of their original holding bearing Gut no. 107/4 and adjoining lands. Their original land bearing Gut No. 118/2/1 is Class I and and Gut No. 107/4 & 125/1/C are Class II lands. Therefore the proposed Final Plot No. 37 has been divided and Final Plot No. 37A has been granted to Gut No. 118/2/1 and Final Plot No. 37B has been granted to 107/4 & 125/1/C.
32		Moho	118/2/1	Class I	587	3050		1220			
33		Moho	125/1/C	Class II	618	2720		1088			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
34	Kusum Shivram Popeta, Bebi Baraku Patil.	Moho	6/1	Class I	153	1400	40	560	2200	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Final Plots no. 37A and 37B, as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
35		Moho	105/5		518	4100		1640			The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 40, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
36	Kisan Nau More, Pandurang Balaram More	Moho	105/6	Class I	519	3000	41	1200	1200	They have not appeared for a hearing and submitted representation on 27.06.2023. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in the NAINA TPS Scheme. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and change in the final plot no as 41A. Final Plot no. 41A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
37	Vaishali Vishvanath Mhatre	Moho	106/1	Class I	520	4900	43	1960	1960	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 43, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
38	Shailendra Hanmant Bhand	Moho	106/3/B	Class I	523	2100	44	840	840	Shri. Dharmesh Shah appeared for the hearing on behalf of Shri. Shailendra Bhand on 27.06.2023 and submitted the representation also. Submission: 1.) They have been given FP no. 44 against their open plot bearing Survey No. 106/3/B. However, the said FP has an old existing residential structure of Shri. Shankar Ganu Mhatre. Instead Shri. Mhatre has been given an open plot bearing FP no. 405 instead of their original land no. 106/3/A and other. 2.) They requested to grant Final Plot of minimum of 50% of their original holding and it shall be granted in adjoining reserved Final Plot no. 45. 3.) They shall be exempted from paying the contribution charges as prescribed in Form I. Submission during the combined hearing of FP 44 and FP 405: i.) Gut No. 106/3/B, Moho is owned by Shri. Shailendra Bhand and in lieu of that FP 44 has been proposed.	By considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The layout of the scheme has been revised and reconstituted Final Plot No. 45, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										However, in place of FP 44, there are 3 residential structures of Shri. Shankar Ganu Mhatre (Proposed owner of FP 405). Therefore Shri. Shailendra Bhand has requested that FP 44 be granted to Shri. Shankar Ganu Mhatre and they shall be granted FP 45 which is reserved for amenity space.	
39	Gavkari Panch Moho	Moho	42	Class II	250	6000	46, 472	2400	6760	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plots no. 46 & 472, as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
40		Moho	91/2	Class II	488	7200		2880			
41		Moho	103/4	Class II	506	700		280			
42		Moho	106/2	Class II	521	3000		1200			
43	Aalya Bendu Mhatre, Baban Bendu Mhatre, Balaram Bendu Mhatre, Gouri Bendu Mhatre	Moho	110/5	Class II	533	5900	47	2360	2360	They have not appeared for a hearing and submitted their representation on 27.06.2023. Submission in representation: 1) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people. Therefore objected to including their land in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 47 was proposed in part of their original holding bearing survey no. 110/5 and adjoining land. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 47, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
44	Baban Bandu Mhatre	Moho	104/3	Class I	511	300	49	120	120	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the Final Plot no. as 49A. Final Plot no. 49A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
45	Savita Baliram Mhatre, Akshay Baliram Mhatre, Ajay Baliram Mhatre, Ankit Baliram Mhatre	Moho	104/5/2	Class I	514	1800	50	720	720	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 50A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
46	Jijabai Tukaram Pate, Bhikaji Tukaram Pate, Baburao Tukaram Pate	Moho	53/2	Class I	306	2100	51, 212	840	11560	They appeared for a hearing on 14.06.2023 and submitted the representation. Submission: 1.) The original lands were owned by their Grandmother Jijabai Tukaram Pathe and after her demise, it got transferred in the name of their father Shri. Bhikaji Tukaram Pathe & Baburao Tukaram Pathe. 2.) They use their land for cultivation	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 51 was proposed in part of their original holding bearing Gut no. 104/1 & 104/2 and adjoining land. Also final plot no. 212 was proposed in part of their original holding bearing Gut no. 53/2. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and
47		Moho	69/4	Class II	394	4300		1720			
48		Moho	104/1	Class II	509	7900		3160			
49		Moho	104/2	Class I	510	3200		1280			
50		Moho	104/4	Class II	512	3600		1440			
51		Moho	136/1	Class I	676	7800		3120			

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										purposes and therefore objected to including it in NAINA TPS no. 06. 3.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and also against the interest of the people and therefore raised their objection to include their land in the said scheme.	updated 7/12 extract. Final Plots no. 51 & 212, as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
52	Namdev Shankar Patil	Moho	102/4	Class II	502	200	52	80	80	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The shape of the Final Plot No. 52 is modified to rectangular shape and slightly shifted downward. Final Plot No. 52, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
53	Y. Venkat Reddy, Rameshkumar Choudhari, Arunkumar Choudhari	Moho	103/5/B	Class I	508	3760	53	1504	1504	<p>The joint hearing of Shri. Yampalla Reddy, Shri. Arunkumar Chaudhari, Bharat Sahakar CHS was organised on 20/07/2023 and 08/08/23.</p> <p>A) Yampalla Reddy submitted a presentation dated 03.08.23</p> <p>1. Final Plot No. 53 is allotted to him along with Arunkumar Chaudhary and Rameshkumar Chaudhary against original survey no. 103/5/B.</p> <p>2. He obtained NA permission and constructed tenements & 3 shops in an area measuring 1900 sq. mt.</p> <p>3. He sold 300 sq. mt. out of 1800 sq. mt owned by him in the original property-wide registered deed of conveyance dated 21.04.16 to Arunkumar Chaudhary and thereafter 1500 sq. mt wide registered deed of conveyance to Rameshkumar Chaudhary.</p> <p>4. It was never agreed between him and the tenement holders to form a society and to transfer the entire original property in favor of society.</p> <p>5. He prayed a) to grant a separate final plot against an 1800 sq. mt. area owned by Arunkumar & Rameshkumar Chaudhary. b) to grant a separate final plot area measuring 1900 sq. mt to Bharat Sahakar CHS.</p> <p>B) Shri. Arunkumar Chaudhary & Shri. Rameshkumar Chaudhary submitted a presentation dated. 03.08.2023.</p> <p>1. They submitted the same points as of Shri. Yampalla Reddy.</p>	<p>1.) The Collector, Raigad wide order dated 13/7/2001 had granted NA and Building Permission under section 44 of Maharashtra Land Revenue Act of 1966 for residential use in the original land bearing Gut No. 103/5/B measuring 3760 sq. mt. As per the sanctioned building plan, the net area of the plot is 3389 sq. mt. and the sanctioned built-up area was 332.4 sq. mt. Also, Group Grampanchayat Vangani tarf Waje had granted them building permission to construct 48 rooms on the said land.</p> <p>2.) Shri. Yampalla Venkat Reddy, wide registered deed of Conveyance dated 21 April 2016 had conveyed 300 sq. mt. of land in the original gut no. 103/5/B to Shri. Arunkumar Chaudhary. Also by registered deed of Conveyance dated 21 April, 2016 had conveyed 1500 sq. mt. of land in the said original land to Shri. Rameshkumar Chaudhary.</p> <p>3) In the sanctioned draft TPS-6, Final plot no. 53, area- 1504 sq.mt. was proposed in lieu of Gut no. 103/5/B, area- 3760 sq.mt. in part area of Gut no. 103/5/B. Final plot no. 54 was proposed in lieu of Gut no. 103/5/A, 103/3, & 129/6 in remaining part of Gut no 103/5/B, which is occupied by existing building of the society.</p> <p>4.) Therefore by considering that the original land bearing no. 103/5/B is NA land and the Collector had granted NA</p>


Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										<p>2. They prayed to grant them a separate final plot against 1800 sq. mt. in lieu of a conveyance deed executed by Mr. Reddy in their favor.</p> <p>C) Chairman & Secretary, Bharat CHS Ltd. submitted a presentation dated 08.08.23</p> <p>1. The Bharat CHS Ltd. is a registered Cooperative housing society registered in 2017. It has 48 members and is situated in the village Moho, Taluka-Panvel in survey no. 103/B, Hissa no. 5B/1 admeasuring 3700 sq. mt.</p> <p>2. Mr. Yampalla Reddy had played fraud on the members and executed the sale deed in respect of the above plot with Mr. Arunkumar Chaudhary and Mr. Rameshkumar Chaudhary, but the possession of the plot is with members of the society.</p> <p>3. They are in the process of finalising the conveyance deed in favor of the society and also filed a civil suit for the cancellation of the sale deed.</p> <p>4. They requested not to issue any rights/alternative plots/development permission against the said land to Mr Yampalla Reddy, Arunkumar Chaudhary & Rameshkumar Chaudhary, as the land belongs to them.</p>	<p>and Building Permission, 3376 sq. m. has been granted as the Final Plot. no.54 , by covering the existing building of the society in the Gut no. 103/5/B. However the society has not done the conveyance of Gut no. 103/5/B in their favor and by registered deed of conveyance, 1800 sq.mt land out of Gut no 103/5/B was transferred in the name of Shri. Arunkumar Chaudhary & Shri. Rameshkumar Chaudhary. Therefore as per updated 7/12 extract, the names of owners in sanctioned draft scheme are maintained. Final Plot no. 54, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
54		Moho	103/3		505	2720		1088			<p>In the sanctioned draft scheme, for their original lands bearing Gut no. 103/3, 103/5/A, 129/6 Final Plot no. 54 was proposed, and for their lands bearing Gut no. 103/1, 103/2, 110/1, 129/4, 129/5 Final Plot no. 125 was proposed. However, Final Plot no. 54 was proposed on the existing building in Gut no. 103/5/B. Therefore for their all lands, a combined Final plot no. 125 has been allotted, by increasing the size of the earlier proposed FP no. 125 in the sanctioned draft Final Plot no. 125, as shown in plan no</p>
55		Moho	103/5/A		507	3670		1468			
56	Abdul Rehman Solanki	Moho	129/6	Class I	654	800	54	320	2876	<p>They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.</p>	




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
57	Anita Abhay Deshapande, Vilas Madanlal Khothari	Moho	110/3	Class I	531	2800	57	1120	1120	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 57, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
58	Rukmini Pandurang Shelke, Vinayak Pandurang Shelke,	Moho	110/2	Class I	530	2900	58	1160	1960	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 58, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
59	Kailas Pandurang Shelae, Latipha Pandurang Shelke, Surekha Pandurang Shelke,	Moho	136/2B		678	2000		800			
60		Moho	111/4/B	Class I	538	1600	59	640	1480	Shri. Vaibhav Narayan Chorghe and Shri. Pratik Koparkar on behalf of Ratan Jaydev Koparkar, appeared for hearing on 25.07.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 59 has been allotted as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
61	Laxmi Maruti Kadav, Ratan Jaydev Koparkar, Vaibhav Narayan Chorghe, Nisha Narayan Chorghe	Moho	116/4		576	2100		840			
62	Rupesh Krishna Kadav	Moho	111/4/A	Class I	537	3110	60	1244	1244	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 60, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
63	Joma Changa Mali, Mahadev Changa Mali, Dvarkabai Janardan Patil, Dhakalibai Changa Mali	Moho	111/5	Class II	539	2300	62	920	920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners, as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 62, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
64	Ganya Kamlu Mhatre, Bhagi Tukaram Bhopi, Subhadra Baliram Mhatre,	Moho	111/2	Class II	535	4500	64	1800	1800	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 64, as shown in plan no 4,



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Rajesh Baliram Mhatre, Santosh Baliram Mhatre, Smita Laxman Tandel, Janabai Namdev Mhatre, Yashvant Namdev Mhatre, Malati Namdev Mhatre, Arati parshuran Kedari.										has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
65	Joma Changu Mali	Moho	112/6	Class I	544	2800	65	1120	1120	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 65 as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
66	Dhau Hiru Patil, Changibai Kisna Bhalekar, Janabai Namdev Patil, Pandurang Namdev Patil, Balaram Namdev Patil, Baliram Namdev Patil, Krishna Namdev Patil, Santosh Namdev Patil, Surekha Kathod Tupe, Sunita Nana Patil, Shaila Subhash Mhatre	Moho	60/2	Class II	342	700	66	280	1928	They appeared for a hearing on 23.06.2023 and submitted the representation dated 23.06.2023. Submission: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 3.) They shall be granted the compensation for Tabela and Trees in their original holding. Also, they shall be granted the certificate of Project Affected Person. 4.) They stated that they are willing to be involved in the scheme only if their above requests are accepted, otherwise the scheme is not accepted by them.	By considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. Their original land bearing Gut No. 112/4 is Class I and and Gut No. 60/2 & 66/5 are Class II lands. Therefore the proposed Final Plot No. 66 has been divided and Final Plot No. 66A has been granted to Gut No. 112/4 and Final Plot No. 66B has been granted to 60/2 & 66/5. Also, as per updated 7/12 extracts the name of the owners have been corrected. Final Plots no. 66A and 66B, as shown in plan no 4 has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
67		Moho	66/5	Class II	380	600		240			
68		Moho	112/4	Class I	543	3520		1408			
69	Janardan Balu Mhatre	Moho	115/3	Class I	565	3500	72	1400	1400	They have submitted representation dated on 10.08.2023. Submission in Representation: 1) The decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is no acceptable to them. 2)	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 72, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										There is no public purpose in NAINA TPS and to include them in the said scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 3) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 4) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-6.	
70	Maymun Ismail Sheikh, Amina Shahfajal Sheikh, Rijvana Siraj Sheikh, Banu Maksud Khan, Bibi Ahmed Sheikh Shaيدا Gana Pinjari, Ramjana Ahmed Sheikh, Muskan Barkat Sheikh, Rafik Ahmed Sheikh, Chandra Mojamali Sheikh	Moho	111/1	Class II	534	2100	73	840	840	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 73, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
71	Vasant Manaji Bhadra, Gita Raghunath Nerulkar, Nirabai Pundalik Patil	Moho	115/4	Class I	566	2200	74	880	880	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 74, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
72	Govind R. Jaydhara	Moho	115/1	Class I	563	8200	75	3280	6640	They appeared for a hearing on 30.05.2023, Submission: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The ownership mentioned in form no. 1 shall be corrected as follows: Govind R. Jaidhara.	By considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to the correction in the name of the owner as per their request. Final Plot no. 75, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
73		Moho	115/2		564	1600		640			
74		Moho	115/5		567	1300		520			
75		Moho	117/1		580	5500		2200			
76	Dhaya Hari Phadke, Gopal Hari Phadke,	Moho	113/6	Class I	550	200	76	80	80	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 76, as shown in plan no 4,



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06										Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area	Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Valkya Gopal Phadke, Mahadev Hari Phadke										has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
77	Motiram Dhondu Patil	Moho	116/1	Class I	569	2400	77	960	960	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 77, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
78	Pundalik Zimagya Patil	Moho	115/6	Class I	568	1600	78	640	640	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 78, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
79	Mainabai Janardan Mhatre, Jagubai Anant Khutarkar, Hareshvar Balaram urf Bama Patil, Sanjay Balaram urf Bama Patil	Moho	111/3	Class II	536	1700	79	680	680	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners, as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 79, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
80	Mahadev Ananta Mhatre, Jayram Ananta Mhatre, Narayan Ananta Mhatre, Janabai Nama Kharke, Barka Gana Patil, Gomibai Shalik Patil	Moho	116/2/A	Class II	570	1750	81	700	700	They appeared for a hearing on 26.06.23 and submitted their representation dated 22.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 81, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
81	Laxman Chahu Mhaskar	Moho	124/1	Class I	608	2500	82	1000	1000	They have neither appeared for hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 82, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
82	Baby Shalikgram Phadke, Subhash Shalikgram Phadke, Sujata Digambar Khandakale, Ganu Narayan Phadke, Bhagwan Narayan Phadke, Siddharth Narayan Phadke, Vasant Narayan Phadke, Ranjna Ram Jambhulkar, Laxmi Madan Patil	Moho	113/2	Class I	546	2700	83	1080	1080	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 83, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
83	Devkabei Namdev Phadke, Parshuram Namdev Phadke, Raghunath Namdev Phadke, Naresh Namdev Phadke, Nirabai Sandeep Jadhav, Shevanti Gurunath Patil	Moho	113/4	Class I	548	2900	84	1160	1160	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 84, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
84	Vasant Manaji Bhadra	Moho	117/2	Class I	581	2200	86	880	3800	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 86, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
85		Moho	117/3		582	2700		1080			
86		Moho	117/5		584	2400		960			
87		Moho	124/4		611	1100		440			
88		Moho	125/3		621	500		200			
89		Moho	125/4/A		622	600		240			
90		Moho	124/6A		613	2470		988			
91		Moho	124/6B		614	2730		1092			
92	Kundlik Sitaram Patil, Bhaskar Tulshiram Patil, Bhanudas Tulshiram Patil	Moho	128/1/B	Class I	639	2400	87	960	3040	They appeared for a hearing on 15.06.23 and submitted their representation dated 15.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 87, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	
93	Laxmibai Hiru Mhatre	Moho	128/1/A	Class I	638	2400	88	960	960	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners, as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 88, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
94	Tukaram Hari Patil, Shyam Hari Patil	Moho	2/6	Class I	136	200	90	80	1240	They have not appeared for a hearing. Shri. Shyam Hari Patil and Shri. Mayur Tukaram Patil submitted representation dated 03.07.2023, Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme. Smt. Vanita Tukaram Patil, Shri. Mayur Tukaram Patil, Smt. Dhanashri Kiran Bhopi, Smt. Namrata Subhash Naik, Smt. Dharati Tukaram Patil submitted representation dated on 03.07.2023, Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 90 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing survey no. 128/2 & 128/3. The location of Final Plot No. 90 has been slightly shifted upward on the same road and as per the updated 7/12 extract, the names of the owners have been changed. Final Plot no. 90 has been allotted, as shown in plan no. 4, to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
95		Moho	128/2		640	1400		560			
96		Moho	128/3		641	1500		600			
97	Dnyanu Bhimrao Mane	Moho	132/3	Class I	666	1000	92	400	400	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 92, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
98	Dharma Kathor Thakur	Moho	132/5	Class I	668	2100	93	840	840	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 93, as shown in plan no 4,



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
99		Chikhale	138/1A		25	3300		1320			has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
100	M/s Rihhab Housing Pvt. Ltd.	Chikhale	139/2	Class I	29	2700	94	1080	2400	They appeared for a hearing on 30.05.2023 and submitted their representation at the time of the hearing and thereafter additional representation on 19/6/2023. Submission 1) Rehab Housing Pvt. Ltd. Own Gut No. 139/2, 138/1A, 142/3, 142/4 in Chikhale and Falguni Patel, who is their family member, owns Gut No. 81/0 in Shivkar Village. Earlier, with the consent letter dated 09.11.2020, they had given consent to provide them with a single final plot in the scheme. However the company has been allotted final plots no. 8 & 94 and Falguni Patel has been allocated Final Plot no. 568 at different locations, therefore they contended that it will lead to hardship in planning and its financial viability, 2.) Civil Suit No. 675/2011 has been disposed of and accordingly wide mutation no. 3598, the entry of "litigation under civil suit no. 675/2011" in the 7/12 extract of Gut No. 142/3 and 142/4 has been deleted. Also, all the lands are under occupancy class I 3.) Therefore they requested to grant one combined final plot in the joint name of the company and Falguni Patel.	In the other right column of the 7/12 extract of Gut no 138/1A, it was mentioned as "kulkayada kalam 63a -1 chya tartudis adhin kharedi- vikris pratibandh". Therefore as per their request, their original lands bearing Gut no. 142/3, 142/4, 139/2, and 81 pt are clubbed together and combined Final Plot no.91 has been granted. For Gut no. 138/1A, Final plot no.94 has been granted. Accordingly Final Plot Nos. 91 & 94, as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
101	Rohidas Tukaram Mhatre	Moho	128/5	Class I	643	2300	95	920	920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners, as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 95, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
102	Narayan Hari Patankar	Moho	128/6/B	Class I	645	800	96	320	320	Shri. Padmakar Chandu Patil appeared for a hearing on 20.06.23 Submission in Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										<p>plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off.</p> <p>4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) As per the order dated 06.07.2021 of Additional Tahsildar and Land Tenancy Authority Panvel, mutation entry number 2552, was approved. Accordingly, the name of the original owner of Gut No. 128/6/B Village Moho, Shri. Narayan Hari Patankar has been canceled and the following names are included as the occupier class II of Gut Number 128/6/B: i.) Aambibai Gopal Phadke, ii.) Padmakar Chindu Patil, iii.) Mahadu Chindu Patil, iv.) Manda Mafa Alias Mahendra Patil, v.) Vaibhav Mafa alias Mahendra Patil, vi.) Vaishali Sanjay Koparkar, vii.) Satish Mafa alias Mahendra Patil.</p> <p>Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.</p>	<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 96 has been allotted, as shown in plan no. 4, to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.</p>
103	Narayan Hari Patankar	Moho	128/6/C	Class I	646	750	97	300	300	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners, as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 97, as shown in plan no.4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.</p>
104	Viraj Sandeep Mhatre, Shantanu Sandeep Mhatre	Moho	126/2	Class I	625	600	98	240	240	<p>They appeared for a hearing on 04.05.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form</p>	<p>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed.</p>



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 98, as shown in plan no. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
105	Narayan Shivram Patil, Lata Chandrakant Uandge, Ravindra Shamrav Ghure	Moho	128/4	Class I	642	3320	99	1328	1328	They submitted their representation on 08.05.23, Submission: 1.) Mrs. Lata Chandrakant Uandge Stated that she owns lands at five different locations in village Moho in joint ownership with others. However, they have been granted Final Plot no. 99, 112,127,308,335 at various locations. Therefore they requested to allot them the combined final plot on a road of larger width for better planning and for consumption of FSI. 2.) In the calculation of betterment charges, the commercial exploitation of plots available to NAINA and income to be generated against that is not taken into consideration, therefore requested to give a setback of income to be generated against these commercial plots. 3.) In the case of TPS planning, the land area of 40% is adequate for common amenities, and the balance of 60% land is to be handed over back to the owner. Thereafter All the partners of M/s Rainbow Developers, Ambadas Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde, Lata Undage and Ravindra Ghure has submitted notarised consent for considering their original land parcels in joint ownership and to provide them a single Final Plot.	All the partners of M/s Rainbow Developers, Ambadas Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde, Lata Undage and Ravindra Ghure has submitted notarised consent for considering their original land parcels in joint ownership and to provide them a single Final Plot. Accordingly, single Final Plot No. 127 has been granted for their original lands bearing 100/4, 102/1A, 1B, 1C, 1E, 1F, 129/3, 130/2, 130/3, 130/7, 131/1, 131/6, and 44/5 (FP No. 112, 127 and 308 in the draft sanctioned scheme.) Their original land bearing no. 128/4 is co-owned by Shri. Narayan Patil and therefore its final plot no. 99 is retained. Also, original land bearing 59/6 is co-owned by Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal & Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal and therefore its final plot no. 335 is retained. Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme.
106	Radhabai Baliram Patil, Shantaram Baliram Patil	Moho	117/6	Class II	585	3300	100	1320	1840	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Final Plot no. 99 has been allotted as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
107		Moho	128/8		648	1300		520			The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners, as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 100, as shown in plan no.4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
108	Balya Hasu Patil	Moho	116/3/C	Class I	575	400	101	160	660	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, as the original lands bearing Gut no. 116/3/C
109		Moho	128/6/A	Class II	644	1250		500			




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											and 128/6/A are of the same ownership, a combined final plot no. 101 was granted. Now as per the updated 7/12 extract, the ownership of Gut no. 116/3/C has been changed. Therefore separate final plots no. 101 A & 101B are allotted for Gut no. 128/6/A and 116/3/C respectively. Final Plot No. 101A & 101B, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
110	Bhagwan Shankar Mhatre	Moho	116/2/B	Class I	571	1050	102	420	420	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 102, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
111	Ballal Vishnu Patankar	Moho	116/2/C	Class I	572	900	104	360	360	Shri. Tukaram Rambhau Mhatre appeared for a hearing on 13.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 4.) As per the order dated 12.06.2017 of Additional Tahsildar and Land Tenancy Authority Panvel mutation entry number 2519, was approved. Accordingly, the name of the original owner of Gut No. 116/2/C Village Moho, Shri. Ballal Vishnu Patankar has been canceled and the following name is included as the occupier class II of Gut Number 116/2/C: Shri. Tukaram Rambhau Mhatre.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 103, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
112	Jitendra Dattatray Shelke, Jivika Dattatray Shelke, Kavita Ravindra Patil, Savita Vishwas Bhoir, Yogita Jagan Phadke,	Moho	116/5	Class II	577	2300	105	920	920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight modification in the shape. Final Plot no. 105, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Lalita Santosh Patil, Bebi Dattatraya Shelke										
113	Baban Aalya Patil, Haribhau Aalya Patil, Nandabai Ramdas Patil, Barkibai Suresh Mhatre, Pushpa Sadu Patil, Gunvanti Aalya Patil, Bamibai Aalya Patil	Moho	116/3/B	Class I	574	250	106	100	100	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 106, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
114		Moho	116/3/A		573	250		100		They appeared for a hearing on 22.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	
115	Padmakar Chindu Patil, Mahadu Chindu Patil, Aambibai Gopal Phadke, Manda Mafa urf Mahendra Patil, Vaibhav Mafa urf Mahendra Patil, Satish Mafa urf Mahendra Patil, Vaishali Sanjay Koparkar	Moho	121/6/C	Class I	602	1390	107	556	656		The sanctioned draft scheme propopsal is confirmed, subject to slight modification in the shape. Final Plot no. 107, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
116	Aambi Bandu Bhopi, Pandurang Ganu Mhatre, Devkabai Rajaram Patil, Vandna Namdev Patil, Changuna Ganu Mhatre, Gangubai Ganu Mhatre, Kisan Dharama Patil, Alka Maruti Bhalekar, Kamal Sakharan Patil, Suman Namdev Dhavale, Rakesh Prakash Patil, Dinesh Prakash Patil, Kamla Maruti Joshi, Vithabai Janrdhan Patil, Sandeep Narayan Gawade, Dhulaji Lakshman Pandhare	Moho	129/1	Class II	649	5100	109	2040	2040	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the number of the final plot. Final Plot no. 108, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
117	Vasant Manaji Bhadra, Sanjay Budhaji Kadav, Ramesh Budhaji Kadav	Moho	118/2/2	Class I	588	6150	110	2460	2460	They appeared for a hearing on 20.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% area	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the


Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) There are three sub-holders of survey no. 118/2/2: a.) Vasant Manaji Bhadra - 1600 sq. m. b.) Sanjay Bhudhaji Kadav - 2250 sq. m. c.) Ramesh Bhudhaji Kadav - 2300 sq. m. and therefore requested to grant independent final plots for all three subholders. 4.) In the holding of Shri. Ramesh Bhudhaji Kadav, a temporary farmhouse of 1342 sq. ft., 20 trees, and one well exists.	regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. As they are sub-holders of Gut no. 118/2/2, the request to grant an independent final plot to each of them can not be considered.
118	Sakharam Shankar Mhatre, Taibai Aappa Mhatre, Aappa Balaram Mhatre	Moho	131/2	Class I	659	500	111	200	200	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Also the number of the final plot has been changed. Final Plot no. 110, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
119	Lata Chandrakant Undage, Ravindra Shamrao Ghure	Moho	131/1	Class I	658	1500	112	600	600	They have submitted their representation on 08.05.23, Submission: 1.) Mrs. Lata Chandrakant Undage Stated that she owns lands at five different locations in village Moho in joint ownership with others. However, they have been granted Final Plot no. 99, 112,127,308,335 at various locations. Therefore they requested to allot them the combined final plot on a road of larger width for better planning and for consumption of FSI. 2.) In the calculation of betterment charges, the commercial exploitation of plots available to NAINA and income to be generated against that is not taken into consideration, therefore requested to give a setback of income to be generated against these commercial plots. 3.) In the case of TPS	All the partners of M/s Rainbow Developers, Ambadas Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde, Lata Undage, and Ravindra Ghure have submitted notarised consent for considering their original land parcels in joint ownership and to provide them a single Final Plot. Accordingly, single Final Plot No. 127 has been granted for their original lands bearing 100/4, 102/1A, 1B, 1C, 1E, 1F, 129/3, 130/2, 130/3, 130/7, 131/1, 131/6, and 44/5 (FP No. 112, 127 and 308 in the draft sanctioned scheme.) Their original land bearing no. 128/4 is co-owned by Shri. Narayan Patil and therefore its final plot no. 99 is retained. Also, the original land bearing 59/6 is co-owned by Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										<p>planning, the land area of 40% is adequate for common amenities, and the balance of 60% land is to be handed over back to the owner. Thereafter All the partners of M/s Rainbow Developers, Ambadas Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde, Lata Undage and Ravindra Ghure has submitted notarised consent for considering their original land parcels in joint ownership and to provide them a single Final Plot.</p>	<p>& Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal, and therefore its final plot no. 335 is retained. Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. Final Plot no. 127 has been allotted as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.</p>
120	Savita Anant Patil, Bhushan Anant Patil, Shantaram Chintu Patil, Dharma Chintu Patil, Bhagwan Chintu Patil, Gangabai Chintu Patil, Sr.no. 2 Gaurdian Savita	Chikhale	136/2	Class I	15	1000	113	400	400	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>In the Sanctioned Interim Development Plan, their original land bearing Gut no. 136/2 was affected by the reservation of Growth Centre and therefore they were granted Final Plot No. 113 in Moho Village.</p> <p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot No. 14, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
121	Jankibai Sitaram Patil, Arun Sitaram Patil, Sunanda Dattatray Patil, Mahadibai Ambaji Thakur, Padma Joma Patil, Chetan Joma Patil, Daivik Joma Patil, Tejaswi Bhanudas Patil	Shivkar	80(P)	Class II	111	1010	114	404	404	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 112, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
122	Ambo Bamma Tople, Hira Bama Tople	Shivkar	52	Class I	72	1500	115	600	600	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>As per updated 7/12 extract, the name of the owners have been changed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 113, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
123	Dilip Hiru Mhatre, Tukaram Dattatrey Patil, Pandhrinath Dattatrey Patil, Phashibai Dattatrey Patil,	Moho	129/2	Class II	650	4500	118	1800	1800	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 115, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted</p>



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Towa Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Lilabai Dattatreya Patil, Shantabai Dattatreya Patil, Shantaram Dattatreya Patil, Sugandha Pandurang Patil, Surdas Dattatreya Patil, Surekha Haribhau Kurangale, Sangita Laxman Pavnekar										to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
124	Ganesh Damu Shelke	Moho	120/5	Class I	593	3100	119	1240	1240	They appeared for a hearing on 21.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have three lands at Moho bearing Gut no. 120/5, 81/1/A, and 81/1/B and have been given Final plots no. 119 and 390 at different locations. They requested to grant a combined square-shaped final plot for their total holding at the place of Final Plot no. 390. Also, they requested to grant a Final Plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. As per their request, their three lands bearing Gut No. 120/5, 81/1/A, & 81/1/B are clubbed together (Final Plot no. 119 & 390 in sanction draft scheme), and combined Final Plot no 116 is allotted. Final Plot No. 116, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
125	Nama Padu Kadav, Ananta Padu Kadav, Raibai Ragho Kadav, Hiraman Ragho Kadav, Prakash Ragho Kadav, Gulabbai Ananta Rodpalkar, Yamunabai Ashok Gaikar, Krishna Bai Ragho Kadav, Janabai Ragho Kadav, Sitabai Rambhau Kadav, Suresh Rambhau Kadav, Yashwant Rambhau Kadav, Durga Narayan Phulore, Kunda Avinash Mhatre	Moho	1/2	Class I	129	500	120	200	3876	They appeared for hearing and submitted their notarised stamped consent letter dated 20/10/2023. It was mentioned that they had distributed their lands between themselves and it was registered wide mutation entry no. 2473, as follows: 1) Hiranman Ragho Kadav & Prakash Ragho Kadav- Gut nos-5/4-14 gunthe, 116/6B-10 gunthe, 68/1/B- 6.70 gunthe, 65/3, - 6 gunthe, 58/5- 13 gunthe. 2) Suresh Rambhau Kadav & Yashwant Rambhau Kadav- Gut nos. 123/6- 22 gunthe, 1/2- 5 gunthe, 5/4- 14 gunthe, 68/1A- 6.30 gunthe. 3) Nama Padu Kadav- Gut no. 5/4- 14 gunthe, 58/5- 16 gunthe, 126/1- 11 gunthe. 4) Nirabai Kadav, Sarita Patil & Surekha	A.) In the sanctioned Draft TPS - 6, 1.) Final Plot no. 120 was proposed for Gut no. 1/2, 65/3, 68/1/A, 116/6/B, 121/3, 123/6, Moho. 2.) Final Plot no. 172 & 263 were proposed for Gut no. 5/4, 58/5, Moho. 3.) Final Plot no. 179 was proposed for Gut no. 126/1, Moho. 4.) Final Plot no. 461 was proposed for Gut no. 68/1/B, Moho. B.) As per registered distribution deed 1442/2020 dated 03.02.2020, mutation entry no. 2473 was registered. Thereafter, according to updated 7/12 extract the name of the owners of above Gut no. are changed. C.) The owners have submitted
126		Moho	65/3		365	600		240			
127		Moho	68/1/A		385	630		252			
128		Moho	116/6/B		579	1060		424			
129		Moho	121/3		596	3200		1280			
130		Moho	123/6		607	3700		1480			




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										Mhatre- Gut Nos. 123/6- 15 gunthe, 121/3- 32 gunthe, 41/5- 11 gunthe. Accordingly they requested to grant separate final plots as per their individual's holdings.	<p>notarised stamped consent letter dated 20.10.20223 and accordingly requested to grant separate final plot as per their holdings.</p> <p>D.) According to their consent letter and updated 7/12 extract, the layout of the scheme has been revised and revised reconstituted final plots are allotted as follows;</p> <p>i.) For Gut no. 5/4, 116/6/B, 68/1/B, 65/3, 58/5, Moho Village total area 4900 sq. m. of Hiranman Ragho Kadav & Prakash Ragho Kadav, Final Plot no. 341 A has been allotted on their existing structure in Gut no. 58.</p> <p>ii.) For Gut no. 123/6, 1/2, 5/4, 68/1/A, Moho Village total area 4730 sq. mt. of Suresh Rambhau Kadav & Yashwant Rambhau Kadav, Final Plot no. 310 has been allotted.</p> <p>iii.) For Gut no. 5/4, 58/5, 126/1, Moho Village total area 4100 sq. m. of Nama Padu Kadav, Final Plot no. 263 has been allotted.</p> <p>iv.) For Gut no. 123/6 & 121/3 total area 4700 sq. m. of Nirabai Anant Kadav, Sarita Balkrishna Patil and Surekha Sunil Mhatre Final Plot no. 118 has been allotted.</p> <p>The area is recorded in Table B.</p>
131	Ananta Shankar Mhatre, Rajiv Pramod Parab	Moho	116/6/A	Class I	578	1040	121	416	416	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>As per updated 7/12 extract, the ownership have been changed.</p> <p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 104, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
132	Savlaram Mahadu Phadke, Manubai Dashrath Patil, Padubai Mahadu Phadke	Moho	113/3	Class I	547	3000	124	1200	1200	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>As per updated 7/12 extract, the ownership have been changed.</p> <p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 49B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted</p>




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
133	Abdul Rahman Ismail Solanki	Moho	103/1	Class I	503	2000	125	800	4772	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, for their original lands bearing Gut no. 103/3, 103/5/A, 129/6 Final Plot no. 54 was proposed, and for their lands bearing Gut no. 103/1, 103/2, 110/1, 129/4, 129/5 Final Plot no. 125 was proposed. However, Final Plot no. 54 was proposed on the existing building in Gut no. 103/5/B. Therefore for their all lands, a combined Final plot no. 125 has been allotted, by increasing the size of the earlier allotted FP no. 125 in the sanctioned draft scheme. Final Plot no. 125, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
134		Moho	103/2		504	2830		1132			
135		Moho	110/1		529	2400		960			
136		Moho	129/4		652	3000		1200			
137		Moho	129/5		653	1700		680			
138	Ananta Joma More, Kavita Eknath Patil, Kanibai Joma More, Sunanda Aambo More, Pandharinath Aambo More, Namdev Aambo More, Nivrutti Aambo More	Moho	110/4	Class II	532	6000	126	2400	2400	They have not appeared for a hearing and submitted representation dated 07.07.2023. Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	As per updated 7/12 extract, the ownership have been changed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 114, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
139	M/s Rainbow Dev. Tarfe Partner, Ambadas Dattatray Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde, Vaishali Pradip Jagdale, Lata Chandrakant Undage, Shubhangi Dhanraj Garad, Anil Ramrao Gogavale, Pramod Babanrao Mehmane, Prakash Vilas Rasal	Moho	100/4	Class I	492	3100	127	1240	7280	They have submitted their representation on 08.05.23, Submission: 1.) Mrs. Lata Chandrakant Undage Stated that she owns lands at five different locations in village Moho in joint ownership with others. However, they have been granted Final Plot no. 99, 112,127,308,335 at various locations. Therefore they requested to allot them the combined final plot on a road of larger width for better planning and for consumption of FSI. 2.) In the calculation of betterment charges, the commercial exploitation of plots available to NAINA and income to be generated against that is not taken into consideration, therefore requested to give a setback of income to be generated against	All the partners of M/s Rainbow Developers, Ambadas Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde, Lata Undage, and Ravindra Ghure have submitted notarised consent for considering their original land parcels in joint ownership and to provide them a single Final Plot. Accordingly, single Final Plot No. 127 has been granted for their original lands bearing 100/4, 102/1A, 1B, 1C, 1E, 1F, 129/3, 130/2, 130/3, 130/7, 131/1, 131/6, and 44/5 (FP No. 112, 127 and 308 in the draft sanctioned scheme.) Their original land bearing no. 128/4 is co-owned by Shri. Narayan Patil and therefore its final plot no. 99 is retained. Also, the original land bearing 59/6 is
140		Moho	102/1/A		493	3900		1560			
141		Moho	102/1/B		494	1330		532			
142		Moho	102/1/C		495	2580		1032			
143		Moho	102/1/E		497	680		272			
144		Moho	102/1/F		498	930		372			
145		Moho	129/3		651	1100		440			
146		Moho	130/2		655	600		240			
147		Moho	130/3		656	780		312			
148		Moho	130/7		657	1200		480			
149		Moho	131/6		663	2000		800			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										these commercial plots. 3.) In the case of TPS planning, the land area of 40% is adequate for common amenities, and the balance of 60% land is to be handed over back to the owner. Thereafter All the partners of M/s Rainbow Developers, Ambadas Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde, Lata Undage and Ravindra Ghure has submitted notarised consent for considering their original land parcels in joint ownership and to provide them a single Final Plot.	co-owned by Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal & Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal, and therefore its final plot no. 335 is retained. Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. Final Plot no. 127 has been allotted as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
150	Vinayak Pandurang Shelke, Kailas Pandurang Shelke	Moho	102/1/D	Class II	496	580	128	232	232	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Their original land bearing 102/1/D and 109/4/1 are clubbed together and combined final plot no. 138 has been granted. Final Plot no. 138, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
151	Moreshwar Bama Patil, Bhau Bama Patil, Anant Bama Patil, Gunabai Changdev Keni	Shivkar	72	Class I	96	3520	130	1408	1408	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 130, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
152		Moho	2/2/1'		131	1210		484			
153	Sunil Kisan Patil, Vilas Kisan Patil, Ganesh Kisan Patil, Aruna Dyaneshwar Paradhi	Moho	102/2	Class I	499	3400	131, 186	1360	1844	Shri. Vilas Kisan Patil appeared for a hearing on 14.06.23 on behalf of Sunil Kisan Patil, Ganesh Kisan Patil, and Aruna Dnyaneshwar Pardhi. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plots no. 131 & 185 have been allotted as shown in plan no. 4, to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	
154	Shubhash Shankar Kadav	Moho	131/3	Class I	660	2010	133A	804	804	They have neither appeared for hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the final plot number. Final Plot No. 132, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
155		Moho	131/4		661	1910		764		Shri. Harishchandra Budhaji Kadav, Shri. Bhavesh Vaman Kadav, Mrs. Kunda Vaman Kadav, and Mrs. Arti Harshad Dhumal appeared for a hearing on 21.06.23 on behalf of Bhudhaji Nama Kadav. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the final plot as per the sanctioned draft TPS. Gut No. 131/4 and 131/5 of Moho Village were earlier owned by Shri. Bhudhaji Nama Kadav. After his demise, Gut No. 131/4 was transferred in the name of Kunda Vaman Kadav, Bhavesh Vaman Kadav, and Aarti Harshad Dhumal, wide mutation entry no. 2647. Also, Gut No. 131/5 was transferred in the name of Harishchandra Bhudhaji Kadav wide mutation entry no. 2622. Accordingly, they requested to grant separate final plots for Gut No. 131/4 and 131/5. 2.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 4.) The land holding of Gut no. 131/5 is fertile and is used for cultivation, it has the following fruitful trees: 41 Mango, 2 Coconut, 3 Guava, 2 Chickoo, 2 Ramfal, 1 Sitafal, 2 Limbu, 1 Kaju and 5 Shekat. It also has an open well and two borewells that supply water to the two villages (Moho and Moho-pada in its vicinity). Also, Gut No. 131/4 has 8 Kalam trees. Their survival is dependent on their income and therefore requested compensation for the same.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 133 was granted in lieu of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 131/4 & 131/5 in part of the same and adjoining lands. Now ownership has been changed. Therefore, as per their request, separate final plots no. 133 A & 133 B have been granted for Gut no. 131/5, & 131/4 respectively. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. Also, as per their request and updated 7/12 extracts the name of owners have been changed. Final Plots No. 133A and 133B have been allotted, as shown in plan no. 4, to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
156	Budhaji Nama Kadav	Moho	131/5	Class I	662	2400	133	960	1724		
157	Maharashtra State Government	Moho	114/4/A	सरकार	558	2600	134	1040	1640	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Final Plot no. 134, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B. It has
158		Moho	114/6/A		561	1500		600			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											been included in public/semi-public users.
159	Joma Shankar Mhatre	Moho	132/4	Class I	667	1300	135	520	520	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 139 B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
160	Lahu Janu Patil	Moho	64/5/B	Class II	361	2400	136	960	2952	Shri. Sanjay Lahu Patil appeared for a hearing on 31.07.23. Submission during the hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The ownership details are incorrect and need an updation. Original lands bearing survey No. 133/1, 133/4, 64/5/B of Village Moho, Taluka - Panvel were earlier in the name of Shri. Lahu Janya Patil, after their demise the ownership was transferred in the names of their heirs as follows: i.) Arun Lahu Patil, ii.) Chandrakala Shashikant Mhatre, iii.) Gangaram Lahu Patil, iv.) Sanjay Lahu Patil, v.) Fashi Lahu Patil, vi.) Sadhana Santosh Jitekar, vii.) Sima Lahu Patil.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed.
161		Moho	133/4'		672	3880		1552			
162		Moho	134/1		674	1100		440			
163	Lahu Janya Patil, Shankar Janya Patil, Bayjubai Changdev Waghmare, Bhagi Janu Patil	Moho	133/1	Class I	670	2020	137	808	808	Shri. Sanjay Lahu Patil appeared for a hearing on 31.07.23. Submission during the hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also,	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										<p>unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The ownership details are incorrect and need an updation. Original lands bearing survey No. 133/1, 133/4, 64/5/B of Village Moho, Taluka - Panvel were earlier in the name of Shri. Lahu Janya Patil, after their demise the ownership was transferred in the names of their heirs as follows: i.) Arun Lahu Patil, ii.) Chandrakala Shashikant Mhatre, iii.) Gangaram Lahu Patil, iv.) Sanjay Lahu Patil, v.) Fashi Lahu Patil, vi.) Sadhana Santosh Jitekar, vii.) Sima Lahu Patil.</p>	<p>concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed.</p> <p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 137, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.</p>
164	Vinayak Pandurang Shelke, Kailas Pandurang Shelke	Moho	109/4/1	Class II	527	2300	138	920	920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>Their original land bearing 102/1/D and 109/4/1 are clubbed together and combined final plot no. 138 has been granted.</p> <p>Final Plot no. 138, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
165	Balaram Savlaram Patil, Anita Anant Patil, Baburav Savlaram Patil, Namdev Savlaram Patil	Moho	133/5'	Class II	673	200	139	80	80	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 180, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
166	Tarabai Sudam Patil, Shevanta Gaju Phadke, Suman Mohan Thakur, Sunita Kailas Dhamanaskar, Sunil Shankar Kadav, Subhash Shankar Kadav, Lilabai Shankar Kadav	Moho	50/5	Class I	289	1000	140	400	400	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract, Final Plot no. 140A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
167	Sunil Shankar Kadav	Moho	132/1	Class I	664	1600	140A	640	640	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in number of the Final Plot as 140B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
168	Pandurang Balam More, Kashinath Balam More, Ramchandra Balam More	Moho	127/1/B	Class II	631	2730	141	1092	1092	They have not appeared for a hearing and submitted representation dated 27.06.2023. Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme. 3.) Gaothan extension has not been taken into consideration.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no. 141 has been granted in part of their original holding bearing Gut no. 127. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 141, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
169	Raghunath Nana More, Janardhan Nana More	Moho	127/1/A	Class II	630	1710	142	684	684	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 142, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
170	Vimlabai Sudam Kadav, Rajaram Sudam Kadav, Arun Sudam Kadav, Mina Sudam Kadav, Sunita Sudam Kadav	Moho	114/1/2	Class II	554	4000	143	1600	1600	Shri. Arun Sudam Kadav and shri. Omkar Rajaram Kadav appeared for a hearing on 22.06.23 & 26.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The ownership details as per form no. 1 is incorrect and need an updation. Ms. Vimlabai Sudam Kadav and Ms. Sunita Sudam Kadav have relinquished their rights in Gut No. 114/1/2. Accordingly wide Mutation entry no. 2608, their names have been canceled, and the following owners' names are retained. i.) Rajaram Sudam Kadav, ii.) Arun Sudam Kadav, iii.) Ms. Meena Sudam Kadav. Accordingly, they requested to correct the ownership record in TPS -6. 6.) The land is	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 143, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										fertile and is been used for cultivation purposes. It has 50 mango trees and 1 Jamun tree on which their livelihood depends and therefore requested for its compensation.	
171	Namdev Posha Mhatre	Moho	125/1/A	Class II	616	1880	144	752	752	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 144, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
172	Vasant Manaji Bhadra	Moho	125/1/D	Class II	619	690	145	276	276	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 145, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
173	Laxman Chahu Mhaskar, Sulochna Ramdas Mhaskar, Abhijit Ramdas Mhaskar, Atish Ramdas Mhaskar, Ashvini Prabhakar Mhatre, Aruna Ramdas Mhaskar	Moho	87/2/A	Class II	472	1500	146	600	3040	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Their original land bearing Gut No. 125/2 is Class I land and Gut No.87/2/A is Class II land. Therefore the proposed Final Plot No. 146 has been divided and Final Plot No. 146A has been granted to Gut No. 125/2 and Final Plot No. 146B has been granted to 87/2/A. Also, as per updated 7/12 extracts the name of the owners have been corrected. Final Plots no. 146A and 146B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
174		Moho	125/2	Class I	620	6100		2440			
175	Ganu Joma Bhagat, Bamibai Narayan Patil	Moho	112/1	Class I	540	3200	147	1280	2920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Their original land bearing Gut No. 112/1 is Class I land and Gut No.112/2 &112/3 are Class II lands. Therefore the proposed Final Plot No. 147 has been divided and Final Plot No. 147A has been granted to Gut No. 112/1 and Final Plot No. 147B has been granted to 112/2 &112/3. Also, as per updated 7/12 extracts the name of the owners have been corrected. Final Plots no. 147A and 147B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
176		Moho	112/2	Class II	541	400		160			
177		Moho	112/3	Class II	542	3700		1480			
178	Lakhman Govabhai Bhatesara, Vishwas Laxman Bhagat	Moho	124/3	Class I	610	1200	149	480	480	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 149, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
179	Dattatray Parshuram Patil, Laxmibai Aambo Shendage, Sitabai Shantaram Patil, Nirmala Bama Patil, Ramdas Kalu Patil, Ganpat Kalu Patil, Shantaram Kalu Patil, Bhau Kalu Patil, Gajanan Kalu Patil, Atmaram Sudam Patil, Ram Sudam Patil, Kalpana Namdev Bhagat, Sindhu Somvary Shisave, Sitabai Ram Gatade, Aasha Shankar Mokal, Yamunabai Sudam Patil, Anita Kundalik Phulore, Baram Gajanan Patil, Dnyaneshwar Gajanan Patil, Bharati Baban Patil, Prajyoti Prakash Mhatre, Kavita Prakash Thakur, Pramila Navnit Mali, Dinesh Baban Patil, Atul Baban Patil	Moho	126/5	Class I	629	3640	150	1456	1456	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 150, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
180	Kundalik Sitaram Patil, Damu Sudam Patil, Bhanudas Tulshiram Patil, Bhaskar Tulshiram Patil, Sadu Dagdu Patil	Moho	127/2	Class II	634	3700	151	1480	1480	They appeared for a hearing on 15.06.23 and submitted their representation dated 15.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 151, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										their objection to include them in the said scheme.	
181	Rajendra Mahadev Patil	Moho	127/3/2	Class I	636	1000	152	400	400	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 152, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
182		Moho	45/4		260	2900		1160		Mrs. Sunita Sudhakar Mahajan appeared for a hearing on 09.05.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) As per proposed draft TPS. 6, a final plot no 153 was proposed against owners combined land bearing Gut no. 45/4, 47/5/B & 127/4 of village Moho. Out of that, lands bearing Gut no. 45/4 & 47/5/B of village Moho were purchased by them by deed of conveyance and accordingly the ownership of lands were transferred in their name in Land and Revenue record. Accordingly, they requested to change the ownership names in respect of final plot no. 153 (pt). 2) As per para 15 of the conveyance deed, out of the proposed Final plot no. 153, a south side portion of the proposed Final plot no. 153 was agreed to be given to smt. Sunita Mahajan against land bearing Gut no. 45/4 & 47/5/B of village Moho. As per the boundaries defined in the conveyance deed, a corner plot facing 20 mt & 27 mt. out of proposed FP no. 153 was agreed to be given to them. Accordingly, they requested to allocate an appropriate sized final plot no 153 as proposed in sanctioned draft TPS no. 6, of appropriate area to them as per agreement/deed of conveyance with the earlier owners instead of proposed odd shaped Final Plot no. 153 A and to change the ownership of land. 3.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 4) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 5) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal	Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. As per the registered sale deed 21/05/2021, between Smt Sunita Mahajan and Shri. Dnyaneshwar Kadav & other 5, Gut no. 45/4 & 47/5/B of village Moho were purchased by smt. Sunita Mahajan and as per clause 15 of the sale deed, it was agreed to allocate southern side of proposed Final plot no. 153 in the draft scheme no. 6, on the junction of 20 mt. and 27 mt. wide roads, to smt. Sunita Mahajan. Accordingly the layout of the scheme has been revised and Final plot no. 153B, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area as recorded in Table B.
183	Jijabai Tukaram Pathe, Dnyaneshwar Balaram Kadav, Vandana Mahadev Pawar, Nanda Ramdas Pardhi, Eknath Balaram Kadav	Moho	47/5/B	Class I	274	2200	153A	880	2040		



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	
184	Jijabai Tukaram Pathe, Dnyaneshwar Balam Kadav, Vandana Mahadev Pawar, Nanda Ramdas Pardhi, Eknath Balam Kadav	Moho	127/4	Class I	637	5200	153	2080	2080	They appeared for a hearing on 14.06.2023 and submitted the representation also. Submission during the hearing: 1.) The land holding belonged to their Grandmother Jijabai Tukaram Pathe and after her demise, it got transferred in the name of their father Bhikaji Tukaram Pathe & Baburao Tukaram Pathe. They use the land for cultivation purposes. NAINA Project is not accepted. Submission in representation: 1.) The NAINA project is not accepted by them and therefore requested to delete their land bearing survey no. 127/4, Moho from NAINA TPS No. 06.	As per the registered sale deed 21/05/2021, between Smt Sunita Mahajan and Shri. Dnyaneshwar Kadav & other 5, Gut no. 45/4 & 47/5/B of village Moho were purchased by smt. Sunita Mahajan and as per clause 15 of the sale deed, it was agreed to allocate southern side of proposed Final plot no. 153 in the draft scheme no. 6, on the junction of 20 mt. and 27 mt. wide roads, to smt. Sunita Mahajan. Accordingly the layout of the scheme has been revised and Final plot no. 153A, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted and of the area as recorded in Table B.
185	Jaydas Maruti Patil Dattatray Maruti Patil Sangita Ramesh Patil Hira Rajesh Dare Nira Maruti Patil Taibai Maruti Patil Umabai Maruti Patil	Moho	127/1/D	Class II	633	4000	154	1600	1600	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 154, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
186	Vasant Nama Kadav	Moho	5/2	Class I	149	1300	156	520	2120	Shri. Hanuman Vasant Kadav appeared for a hearing and submitted their representation on 23.06.2023. Submission during the hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) They requested to allow the consumption of 3.00 FSI on their final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) They have stable and trees on their land, for which they requested to give compensation. Also, requested for Project Affected People	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed.
187		Moho	114/1/1	Class II	553	4000		1600		5.) They have stable and trees on their land, for which they requested to give compensation. Also, requested for Project Affected People	Their original land bearing Gut No. 5/2 is Class I land and Gut No.114/1/1 is Class II land. Therefore the proposed Final Plot No. 156 has been divided and Final Plot No. 156A has been granted to Gut No. 5/2 and Final Plot No. 156B has been granted to 114/1/1. Also, as per updated 7/12 extracts the name of the owners have been corrected.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										certificate. Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	Final Plots No. 156A & 156B, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
188	Jitendra Janardan Topale, Jayvant Janardan Topale	Moho	126/4/1	Class I	627	3900	157	1560	1560	Shri. Jitendra Janardan Tople appeared for a hearing on 14.06.2023. Submission in Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 157, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
189	Nirmala Baliram Kadav, Anant Baliram Kadav, Shailja Madhukar Choudhari, Vanita Janardhan Shelke, Savita Baliram Kadav	Moho	126/4/2	Class II	628	3800	158	1520	1520	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract Final Plot no. 158, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
190	Vivek Dnyaneshwar Patil	Shivkar	44/2	Class I	61	1920	159	768	1812	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 159, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
191		Shivkar	44/3		62	510		204			
192		Shivkar	50		70	1000		400			
193		Shivkar	51		71	1100		440			
194	Sant Krupa Housing Society Tarfe Chief Promoter Vijay Dharma Jamsutkar.	Moho	6/3/A	Class I	157	4000	160	1600	1600	They have not appeared for a hearing and submitted representation on 04.05.2023. Submission in Representation: 1.) The contribution amount as per Form-1 is not accepted and concession shall be provided for the same. 2.) Demarcation of the plot and development of physical infrastructure shall be completed as soon as possible.	The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 160, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
195	Harishchandra Chandar Patil	Moho	6/3/B/1	Class I	158	1700	161	680	680	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 161, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
196	Prakash Gajanan Pote	Moho	6/3/B/2	Class I	159	2900		1160		They appeared for a hearing on 10.05.2023, Submission during the hearing: 1.) They do not accept the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. During the Land Owner's meeting, they were allotted two different plots out of which one was having a frontage of 27M wide road, situated at the corner. (Earlier Final Plot No. 162). However, in the sanctioned draft TPS they were allotted a combined plot which has a frontage of 15M wide road. They requested to allot them the plot which has a frontage of 27M wide road and in place of FP No. 162 which was their earlier demarcated location. 2.) Also, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 3.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 4) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 164, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
197	Akash Prakash Pote, Sidhesh Vishwas Pote, Pratik Prakash Pote	Moho	27/1/E	Class II	165	3600	163	1440	2600		
198		Moho	5/1		148	2100		840		Shri. Janardan Tukaram Ghogare appeared for a hearing on 23.06.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) They requested to allow the consumption of 3.00 FSI on their final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High	
199	Janardan Tukaram Ghogare, Dilip Tukaram Ghogare, Sunita Ganu Ghogare, Suraj Ganu Ghogare, Swapnil Ganu Ghogare, Guardian Mother Sunita Ganu Ghogare.	Moho	38/6	Class I	226	1500	164	600	1440		As per their request separate Final Plot no. 172 has been allotted for the land




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										<p>Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) They have their home (wada) and trees in their place for which they requested to give compensation. Also, requested for Project Affected People certificate.</p> <p>Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.</p> <p>Shri. Ritesh Nama Mhatre appeared for a hearing on 14.07.23.</p> <p>Submission in hearing: 1.) Land bearing survey no. 38/6 was purchased by Shri. Amar Nama Mhatre and Shri. Ritesh Nama Mhatre from Shri. Janardan Ghogare and 5 others, thus requesting to allot a separate final plot for survey no. 38/6, adjacent to a road. Also, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.</p>	<p>bearing Gut no. 5/1 and Final Plot no. 452 has been allotted for Gut no. 38/6. Also, as per their request and updated 7/12 extracts the name of the owners have been changed.</p> <p>Final Plots No. 172 and 452, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.</p>
200	Vimal Sudam Kadav, Rajaram Sudam Kadav, Arun Sudam Kadav, Mina Sudam Kadav, Sunita Santosh Patil.	Moho	5/3	Class I	150	1200	165	480	480	<p>Smt. Nilam Rajdev Khataavkar appeared for a hearing on 09.08.23.</p> <p>Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall</p>	<p>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new</p>



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 2.) The ownership details in form -1, are incorrect and need an updation, Survey No. 5/3 was purchased by Smt. Nilam Rajdev Khatavkar from Shri. Vimal Sudam Kadav and 4 others.	regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 165, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
201	Fashibai Dattaterey Patil	Moho	3/5	Class I	142	4100	166	1640	1640	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 166, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
202	Mathura Gajanan Patil, Dnyaneshwar Gajanan Patil, Balaram Gajanan Patil, Gulab Pundalik Fullore	Moho	3/1/A	Class I	137	2320	167	928	928	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 167, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
203		Moho	5/5		152	2200		880		Shri. Santosh Shankar Kadav appeared for a hearing on 15.06.2023. Submission during the hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The land ownership is incorrect, the survey no. 5/5 and 57/1 of Village Moho, Taluka Panvel were in the name of their father Shankar Goma Kadav, and after their demise, it got transferred in the name of their heir, Shri. Santosh Shankar Kadav. Accordingly requested to correct the ownership title.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 168, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
204	Shankar Goma Kadav	Moho	57/1	Class I	320	900	168	360	1240		



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
205	Shankar Goma Kadav	Moho	56/3	Class I	313	300	169	120	120	Shri. Santosh Shankar Kadav appeared for a hearing on 15.06.2023. Submission during the hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The land ownership is incorrect, the survey no. 5/5 and 57/1 of Village Moho, Taluka Panvel were in the name of their father Shankar Goma Kadav, and after their demise, and it got transferred in the name of their heir, Shri. Santosh Shankar Kadav. Accordingly requested to correct the ownership title.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 169, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
206	Chandar Balya Pathe	Moho	118/1	Class II	586	5700	171	2280	2280	They have neither appeared for hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 170, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
207	Nama Padu Kadav, Ananta Padu Kadav, Mahadi Rambhau Gaikar, Raibai Ragho Kadav, Hiranman Ragho Kadav, Prakash Ragho Kadav, Gulabbai Ananta Rodpalkar, Yamunabai Ashok Gaykar, Krushnabai Ragho Kadav, Janabai Ragho Kadav, Sitabai Rambhau Kadav, Suresh Rambhau Kadav, Yashwant Rambhau Kadav, Durga Narayan Fulare, Kunda Avinash Mhatre.	Moho	5/4	Class I	151	4200	172, 263	1680	2840	They have not appeared for a hearing and submitted representation dated 28.06.2023. Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to including them in the said scheme.	A.) In the sanctioned Draft TPS - 6, 1.) Final Plot no. 120 was proposed for Gut no. 1/2, 65/3, 68/1/A, 116/6/B, 121/3, 123/6, Moho. 2.) Final Plot no. 172 & 263 were proposed for Gut no. 5/4, 58/5, Moho. 3.) Final Plot no. 179 was proposed for Gut no. 126/1, Moho. 4.) Final Plot no. 461 was proposed for Gut no. 68/1/B, Moho. B.) As per registered distribution deed 1442/2020 dated 03.02.2020, mutation entry no. 2473 was registered. Thereafter, according to updated 7/12 extract the name of the owners of above



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
208	Nama Padu Kadav, Ananta Padu Kadav, Raibai Ragho Kadav, Hiraman Ragho Kadav, Prakash Ragho Kadav, Gulababai Ananta Rodpalkar, Yamunabai Ashok Gaikar, Krishnabai Ragho Kadav, Janabai Ragho Kadav, Sitabai Rambhau Kadav, Suresh Rambhau Kadav, Yashwant Rambhau Kadav, Durga Narayan Fulore, Kunda Avinash Mhatre, Mahadibai Rambhau Gayakar	Moho	58/5		333	2900		1160			<p>Gut no. are changed.</p> <p>C.) The owners have submitted notarised stamped consent letter dated 20.10.20223 and accordingly requested to grant separate final plot as per their holdings.</p> <p>D.) According to their consent letter and updated 7/12 extract, the layout of the scheme has been revised and revised reconstituted final plots are allotted as follows;</p> <p>i.) For Gut no. 5/4, 116/6/B, 68/1/B, 65/3, 58/5, Moho Village total area 4900 sq. m. of Hiranman Ragho Kadav & Prakash Ragho Kadav, Final Plot no. 341 A has been allotted on their existing structure in Gut no. 58.</p> <p>ii.) For Gut no. 123/6, 1/2, 5/4, 68/1/A, Moho Village total area 4730 sq. mt. of Suresh Rambhau Kadav & Yashwant Rambhau Kadav, Final Plot no. 310 has been allotted.</p> <p>iii.) For Gut no. 5/4, 58/5, 126/1, Moho Village total area 4100 sq. m. of Nama Padu Kadav, Final Plot no. 263 has been allotted.</p> <p>iv.) For Gut no. 123/6 & 121/3 total area 4700 sq. m. of Nirabai Anant Kadav, Sarita Balkrishna Patil and Surekha Sunil Mhatre Final Plot no. 118 has been allotted.</p> <p>The area is recorded in Table B.</p>
209	Arun Dhondur Patil	Moho	6/4	Class I	160	5700	173	2280	2280	<p>They appeared for a hearing and submitted representation on 15.06.2023</p> <p>Submission during the hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not</p>	<p>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed.</p> <p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is</p>




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 173, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
210		Moho	3/3		140	2200		880			Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed.
211	Baliram Dunkur Patil, Pundalik Dunkur Patil	Moho	3/4	Class II	141	500	175	200	1080	Shri. Shantaram Pundalik Patil appeared for a hearing on 23.06.2023 Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) They requested to allow the consumption of 3.00 FSI on their final plot Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) Gut no. 3/3, 3/4, 52/2, 52/6, 53/3, 57/6, and 127/1/C of Village Moho, Tal- Panvel were in combined ownership of Shri. Baliram Dunkur Patil and Pundalik Dinkar Patil. Thereafter the lands were separated and Gut No. 52/2 and 3/3 were allotted in the ownership of Shri. Pundalik Dinkar Patil and therefore requested to grant separate Final Plot for Gut No. 52/2 and 3/3. 6.) They have stable and trees on their land, for which they requested to give compensation. Also, requested for Project Affected People certificate.	1.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 3/3 & 52/2 are now owned by Shri. Pundalik Dinkar Patil and therefore as per their request separate Final Plot no. 202, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B. 2.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 52/6, 53/3, 57/6, 7/1 are now owned by Shri. Baliram Dunkur Patil and therefore separate Final Plot no. 285, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B. 3.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 3/4 is now owned by Janaradhan Nana More and Naresh Baburao Patil and therefore separate Final Plot no. 201A as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											in Table B. 4.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no.127/1/C is now owned by Jitendra Yugraj Jain, Mahavir Basantilal Surana, Vipul Kamal Parekh and therefore separate Final Plot no. 213, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
212	Shantaram Dhondu Patil, Chandrabhaga Dinkar Bhagat, Bebi Harishchandra Bhagat	Moho	3/2	Class II	139	2800	176	1120	1120	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 176, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
213	Sulochana Ramdas Patil, Mohan Ramdas Patil,	Moho	3/1/B	Class I	138	2480	177	992	1152	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 177, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
214	Yashwant Ramdas Patil, Bharat Ramdas Patil, Minakshi Motiram Mhatre.	Moho	60/3/2		344	400		160			
215	Ananta Padu Kadav, Nama Padu Kadav, Raibai Ragho Kadav, Hiraman Ragho Kadav, Prakash Ragho Kadav, Gulabbai Ananta Rodpalkar, Yamunabai Ashok Gaikar, KrishnaBai Ragho Kadav, Janabai Ragho Kadav, Sitabai Rambhau Kadav, Suresh Rambhau Kadav, Yashwant Rambhau Kadav, Durga Narayan Phulare, Kunda Avinash Mhatre	Moho	126/1	Class I	624	1100	179	440	440	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	A.) In the sanctioned Draft TPS - 6, 1.) Final Plot no. 120 was proposed for Gut no. 1/2, 65/3, 68/1/A, 116/6/B, 121/3, 123/6, Moho. 2.) Final Plot no. 172 & 263 were proposed for Gut no. 5/4, 58/5, Moho. 3.) Final Plot no. 179 was proposed for Gut no. 126/1, Moho. 4.) Final Plot no. 461 was proposed for Gut no. 68/1/B, Moho. B.) As per registered distribution deed 1442/2020 dated 03.02.2020, mutation entry no. 2473 was registered. Thereafter, according to updated 7/12 extract the name of the owners of above Gut no. are changed. C.) The owners have submitted notarised stamped consent letter dated 20.10.20223 and accordingly requested to grant separate final plot as per their holdings. D.) According to their consent letter and updated 7/12 extract, the layout of the scheme has been revised and revised reconstituted final plots are allotted as follows.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											<p>i.) For Gut no. 5/4, 116/6/B, 68/1/B, 65/3, 58/5, Moho Village total area 4900 sq. m. of Hiranman Ragho Kadav & Prakash Ragho Kadav, Final Plot no. 341 A has been allotted on their existing structure in Gut no. 58.</p> <p>ii.) For Gut no. 123/6, 1/2, 5/4, 68/1/A, Moho Village total area 4730 sq. mt. of Suresh Rambhau Kadav & Yashwant Rambhau Kadav, Final Plot no. 310 has been allotted.</p> <p>iii.) For Gut no. 5/4, 58/5, 126/1, Moho Village total area 4100 sq. m. of Nama Padu Kadav, Final Plot no. 263 has been allotted.</p> <p>iv.) For Gut no. 123/6 & 121/3 total area 4700 sq. m. of Nirabai Anant Kadav, Sarita Balkrishna Patil and Surekha Sunil Mhatre Final Plot no. 118 has been allotted.</p> <p>The area is recorded in Table B.</p>
216	Ramchandra Gharu Patil, Kashinath Gharu Patil, Pandurang Gharu Patil, Indu Ramkrushna Kharke	Chikhale	133/3(P)	Class II	10	270	180	108	108	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in Final Plot no. 179, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
217	Balaram Charu Patil, Ganesh Charu Patil, Sunita Narayan Choudhary, Baby Padmakar Usatkar, Pratima Prakash Patil	Shivkar	90/2(P)	Class II	114	180	181	72	72	They have not appeared for a hearing and submitted representation dated 15.06.2023. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The proportion of land being taken by NAINA, CIDCO is not accepted. 3.) The said NAINA TPS is against their interest and, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme. 4.) Gaothan extension shall be considered.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 181, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
218	Devkabai Janardan Patil	Moho	126/3	Class I	626	1100	183	440	440	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 178, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
219	Ganu Balu Patil, Janabai	Moho	3/6	Class I	143	2500	184, 565	1000	3680	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership and Final Plot no. as 183 &
220	Kashinath Bhopi, Sagunabai	Moho	50/6	Class II	290	400		160			
221	Sitaram Shelke, Goma	Moho	53/5	Class II	309	1800		720			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
222	Dharma Patil, Balaram Dharma Patil, Hanuman Dharma Patil, Bhagwan Dharma Patil, Vanita Sawalaram Patil, Sushila Haribhau Patil, Arun, Tukaram Shelke, Dnyaneshvar Tukaram Shelke, Sopan Tukaram Shelke, Gitabai Jayvant Wajekar, Surekha Haribhau Kurangale, Surdas Dattatreya Patil, Sugandha Pandurang Patil, Shantaram Dattatreya Patil, Shantabai Dattatreya Patil, Lilabai Dattatreya Patil, Fashibai Dattatreya Patil, Tukaram Dattatreya Patil, Pandharinath Dattatreya Patil, Sangita Laxman Pavaneekar.	Moho	138/1	Class I	681	4500		1800			565. Final Plot no. 183 & 565, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
223	Aanandi Dhamba Dhavale, Ambaji Dhamba Dhavale, Pandurang Dhamba Dhavale, Balaram Dhamba Dhavale, Mahadev Dhamba Dhavale, Tarabai Kana Patil, Bhuribai Keshav Gawade, Anjana Hasu Tare, Santosh Hasu Tare	Shivkar	26/3	Class II	52	1640	185	656	656	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in Final Plot no. 184, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
224	Janardan Changa Patil	Moho	2/2/2	Class I	132	1200	187	480	480	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 187, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
225	Dhamba Dharma Patil, Padubai Ladku Tupe, Balaram Charu Patil, Ganesh Charu Patil, Sunita Narayan Chaudhari, Baby Padmakar Usatkar, Pratibha Prakash Patil	Shivkar	44/4	Class II	63	2070	188	828	828	They have not appeared for a hearing and submitted representation dated 15.06.2023, submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The proportion of land being taken by NAINA, CIDCO is not accepted. 3.) The said NAINA TPS is against their interest and, therefore raised their	Their original land bearing Gut no. 44/4 is affected by IDP reservations of the City park and playground. They have been granted the final plot on a 15 mt wide road. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 188 has been allotted as shown in plan no. 4 to the



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										objection to include them in the said scheme. 4.) Gaothan extension shall be considered.	owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
226	Ananta Kashinath Patil, Sunil Kashinath Patil, Dashrath Kashinath Patil, Ganesh Bhagwan Patil, Umesh Bhagwan Patil, Bhupesh Bhagwan Patil	Moho	51/1/5/4	Class I	294	4800	190	1920	1920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 190, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
227	Jija Tukaram Pathe, Dnyaneshwar Balaram Kadav, Vandana Mahadev Pawar, Nanda Ramdas Pardhi, Eknath Balaram Kadav	Moho	51/2	Class I	295	400	191	160	560	They appeared for a hearing on 14.06.2023 and submitted the representation also. Submission during the hearing: 1.) The land holding belonged to their Grandmother Jijabai Tukaram Pathe and after her demise, it got transferred in the name of Bhikaji Tukaram Pathe & Baburao Tukaram Pathe. They use their land for cultivation purposes. NAINA Project is not accepted. Submission in representation: 1.) The NAINA project is not accepted by them and therefore requested to delete their land bearing survey no. 51/2 Moho from NAINA TPS No. 06.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership as verified from the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 191, as shown in plan no. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
228		Moho	127/3/1	Class II	635	1000		400		1.) The NAINA project is not accepted by them and therefore requested to delete their land bearing survey no. 51/2 Moho from NAINA TPS No. 06.	
229	Kundalik Sitaram Patil, Bhaskar Tulshiram Patil, Bhanudas Tulshiram Patil	Moho	51/3	Class I	296	400	193	160	160	They appeared for a hearing on 15.06.23 and submitted their representation dated 15.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS, however, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 193, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										their objection to include them in the said scheme.	
230	Eknath Ramdas Patil	Moho	51/4	Class I	297	500	194	200	200	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 194, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
231	Shankar Janu Patil	Moho	114/4/B	Class II	559	2500	195	1000	1000	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 195, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
232	Deviche Deol Vahi., Dinkar Dhau Patil	Moho	51/6	Class I	298	400	196	160	160	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 196, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
233	Shankar Janu Patil	Moho	52/1/A	Class II	299	2290	197	916	1556	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 197, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
234		Moho	100/1		489	1600		640			
235	Pandurang Namdev Patil, Baliram Namdev Patil, Balaram Namdev Patil, Krushna Namdev Patil, Santosh Namdev Patil	Moho	52/1/B	Class II	300	3210	198	1284	1284	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 198, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area as recorded in Table B.
236	Janardan Nana More	Moho	125/4/B	Class I	623	400	199	160	160	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 199, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
237	Mahadev Goma Tople, Ramabai Chandrakant Tople, Ashok Chandrakant Tople, Kishore Chandrakant Tople, Kiran Chandrakant Tople	Shivkar	79/4(P)	Class II	110	330	200	132	132	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 200, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area as recorded in Table B.
238	Baliram Dunkur Patil, Pundalik Dunkur Patil	Moho	52/2	Class II	301	4900	202	1960	3064	Shri. Shantaram Punalik Patil appeared for a hearing on 23.06.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the
239		Moho	52/6		305	400		160			
240		Moho	53/3		307	400		160			
241		Moho	57/6		326	500		200			
242		Moho	127/1/C		632	1460		584			

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										<p>grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) They requested to allow the consumption of 3.00 FSI on their final plot and if some area remains unutilisable avail them TDR in lieu of the same. 3.) The survey no. 3/3, 3/4, 52/2, 52/6, 53/3, 57/6, and 127/1/C of Village Moho, Tal-Panvel were in combined ownership of Shri. Baliram Dunkar Patil and Pundalik Dinkar Patil. Thereafter the lands were separated and Gut No. 52/2 and 3/3 were allotted in the ownership of Shri. Pundalik Dinkar Patil and therefore requested to grant separate Final Plot for Gut No. 52/2 and 3/3. 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 6.) They have stable and trees on their land, for which they requested to give compensation. Also, requested for Project Affected People certificate.</p> <p>Shri. Kunal Krushna Patil appeared for a hearing and submitted representation on 15.06.2023.</p> <p>Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) The ownership details as per form -1, are incorrect/ needs an updation. Survey No. 52/6, 53/3, and 57/6 of village Moho were earlier in the combined ownership of Shri. Baliram Dunkur Patil and Shri. Pundalik Dunkur Patil, however Shri. Pundalik Dunkur Patil has relinquished their right from the respective survey no. wide mutation entry no. 2555 and therefore the Final Plot No. 202 shall be allotted in the name of Shri. Baliram Dunkur Patil. Also Shri. Baliram Dunkur Patil has relinquished his rights in survey no. 52/2 and 127/1/C and it remains in the name of Shri. Pundalik</p>	<p>regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed</p> <p>1.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 3/3 & 52/2 are now owned by Shri. Pundalik Dinkar Patil and therefore as per their request separate Final Plot no. 202, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.</p> <p>2.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 52/6, 53/3, 57/6, 7/1 are now owned by Shri. Baliram Dunkar Patil and therefore separate Final Plot no. 285, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.</p> <p>3.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 3/4 is now owned by Janaradhan Nana More and Naresh Baburao Patil and therefore separate Final Plot no. 201A as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.</p> <p>4.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 127/1/C is now owned by Jitendra Yugraj Jain, Mahavir Basantilal Surana, Vipul Kamal Parekh and therefore separate Final Plot no. 213, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.</p>



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										Dunkur Patil only. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is against their interest and, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	
243	Pundlik Valaku kadav, Namdev Valaku kadav, Vitthal Valaku kadav, Indu Jethya Patil, Dhakali Valaku kadav	Moho	2/1	Class I	130	500	203	200	3840	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 203, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area as recorded in Table B.
244		Moho	2/5		135	1000		400			
245		Moho	52/4		303	2500		1000			
246		Moho	67/1/1		382	4000		1600			
247		Moho	68/3		388	1600		640			
248	Gajanan Govinda Patil, Kundalik Govinda Patil, Sundar Motiram Bhopi, Janabai Shivaji Patil	Moho	51/1/1	Class I	291	1200	204	480	480	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 204, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area as recorded in Table B.
249	Dilip Balam Patil, Bharat Balam Patil, Kunda Balam Patil, Anusaya Balam Patil	Moho	51/1/3	Class I	293	400	205	160	160	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 205, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area as recorded in Table B.
250	Shankar Janu Patil	Moho	114/6/B	Class II	562	1500	206	600	600	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 206, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
251	Revubai Rama Kadav	Moho	123/4	Class I	605	1000	207	400	400	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed., subject to change in Final Plot no. 207B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
252	Malati Balam Kadav, Sangita Balam Kadav, Saya Ankush Kadav, Nitin Ankush Kadav, Akshay Ankush Kadav, Vishal Ankush Kadav, Dhananjay Lahu Kadav	Moho	123/3	Class I	604	800	213	320	320	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in location. Final Plot no. 214A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
253	Shantaram Dhondur Patil	Moho	128/7	Class II	647	1900	216	760	760	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 216, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area as recorded in Table B.
254	Bhau Posha Mhatre, Lilabai Pundalik Kadav, Kanchan Hiranman Kadav, Jayram Ananta Mhatre, Pandurang Namdev Patil, Budhaji Rambhau Mhatre, Sunita Ganesh Ghongre, Dhanshree Maya Patil	Moho	56/6/A (P)	Class I	316	900	217	1589.18	1589.18	They have not appeared for a hearing. Shri. Machhindra Jayram Mhatre, Smt. Lilabai Pundalik Kadav, Smt. Vanita Pandurang Kadav, Smt. Kanchan Hiranman Kadav submitted representations on 26.06.23. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	The owners of Gut no. 56/6/A submitted representation dated 08.09.2023 and notarised affidavit. It is stated that survey no. 56/6 has three hissas 56/6/A, 56/6/B and 56/6/C. Their hissa no. 56/6/A is situated along the west boundary of 56/6 and it is adjoining to gaathan. Their RCC residential houses are existing there for last 45 to 50 years. According they request to delete the said Sutvey no. 56/6/A from TPS- 6. In sanctioned draft TPS- 6, the said gut no. 56/6/A, adjoining to Moho Gaathan, was not included in the TPS area. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 217A & 217B for Gut no. 56/6/B & 56/6/C respectively, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
255	Baliram Dunkur Patil, Pundalik Dunkur Patil	Moho	56/6/B (P)	Class I	317	1500				Shri. Kunal Krushna Patil appeared for a hearing on 15.06.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. Survey no. 56/6/A comprise of structures of Shri. Bhau Posha Mhatre and other 7 and survey no. 56/6/C comprises of house of Shri. Shantaram Patil. Therefore, they requested to grant separate final plot for their Gut no. 56/6/B. Also requested to grant the final plot of minimum 60% area of their original land. 2.) The ownership details as per form -1, are incorrect/ needs an updation. The Survey No. 56/6/B of village Moho were earlier in the combined ownership of Shri. Baliram Dunkur Patil and Shri. Pundalik Dunkur Patil, however Shri. Pundalik Dunkur Patil has waived their right from the respective survey no. wide mutation entry no. 2555 thus the Final Plot No. 217 shall be only in the name of Shri. Baliram Dunkur Patil. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4.) By considering the development of High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that the premium	



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										shall not be charged. Joint Hearing of all the land holders of Gut no. 56/6/A, B.C was conducted on 08.09.23 Submission in the hearing: 1.) The measurement plan showing boundaries of three hissas in Gut no. 56/6 is not available with them. In general gut no. 56/6/A is on the western boundary of Gut no. 56/6 and there is 9 residential houses are existing since last 40 to 50 years. Gut no. 56/6/B is situated between 56/6/A & 56/6/C and therein Poultry farm is existed. Gut no. 56/6/C is on the eastern boundary of Gut no. 56/6 and therein 2 houses are existed. 2.) They requested to delete all their land from the TPS -6.	
256	Shantaram Dhondu Patil	Moho	56/6/C' (P)	Class II	318	2600				They have not appeared for hearing and submitted representation dated on 26.06.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) Their written consent were not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	
257	Cemetery	Moho	55	सरकार	310	1300	219	520	520	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 219, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
258	Chandrabhaga Maruti Patil, Gajanan Maruti Patil, Vijay Maruti Patil, Dilip Maruti Patil, Naresh Maruti Patil, Shyam Maruti Patil, Gaurdian Mother Chandrabhaga Maruti Patil, Sugandha Maruti Patil	Shivkar	90/1(P)	Class II	113	2750	222	1100	1100	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 222, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
259	Budhaji Rambhau Mhatre	Moho	89/1	Class I	476	4000	223	1600	1600	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract, the area of Gut no. 89/1 is 2100 sq. mt. According, the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 223A, as shown in plan no 4, has been




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
260	Ragho Changa Patil	Moho	89/5	Class I	482	2900	224	1160	1160	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 224, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
261	Dinkar Tukaram Mhatre, Namdev Tukaram Mhatre, Janabai Maya Mhatre, Santosh Maya Mhatre, Raghunath Maya Mhatre, Jaydas Maya Mhatre, Kishori Kishor Gharat	Moho	89/3/2	Class I	479	1600	225	640	1760	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 225, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
262		Moho	89/4/1		480	2800		1120			
263	Shankar Kamlu Pathe	Moho	90/1	Class II	484	4500	227	1800	1800	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 227, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
264	Sanjay Gajanan Patankar, Raghunath Chandar Gharat, Nitin Shashikant Povale	Moho	89/6'	Class I	483	2000	229, 231	800	7260	Shri. Sanjay Gajanan Patkar appeared for a hearing on 12.05.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. They earlier requested CIDCO to grant a combined square-shaped final plot on a bigger road by amalgamating Final Plot No. 229 and 231. Also, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) The ownership details as per form -1 shall be grammatically corrected as Sanjay Gajanan Patkar. 3.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plots No. 229, 231 as shown in plan No. 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
265	Sanjay Gajanan Patkar, Raghunath Chandar Gharat	Moho	90/2/B		486	9450		3780			
266	Sharad Mahadev Dhope, Sanjay Gajanan Patkar, Raghunath Chander Gharat, Sharad Mahadev Dhope	Chikhale	140/3B		36B	6700		2680			




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
267	Bamibai Posha Mhatre, Bhau Posha Mhatre, Yamibai Hiru Gadkari, Duklibai Govind Patil, Shakun Janardan Phadke, Soni Kundlik Patil, Chalabai Balaram Patil, Radhabai Hari Chaudhari, Chandubai Tukaram Tupe, Narendra Kisan Mhatre, Sharad Kisan Mhatre, Sunil Kisan Mhatre, Rukmini Gopinath Mhatre, Anil Gopinath Mhatre, Pramod Gopinath Mhatre, Vinod Gopinath Mhatre, Rupali Gopinath Mhatre, Deepali Gopinath Mhatre, Gaurdian Rukmini Gopinath Mhatre.	Moho	77/2/1	Class II	444	4200	230	1680	2340	Shri. Narendra alias Narayan Kisan Mhatre and Bhau Posha Mhatre appeared for a hearing on 21.06.2023 and 22.06.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) FSI of 2.5 shall be granted on their final plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) They shall be granted priority as Project Affected Persons for jobs in The Navi Mumbai International Airport Project. 6.) Their status as farmers shall be retained and they shall be granted compensation for the trees that existed therein.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 230, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
268		Moho	90/2/A		485	1650		660			
269	Gavkari Panch Inam	Moho	91/1	Class II	487	9000	233	3600	3600	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 233, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B. It has been included in public/semi-public users.
270	Maruti Pama Phadke	Moho	100/3	Class I	491	3100	235	1240	1240	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 235, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
271	Gana Govind Topale	Shivkar	78/3	Class II	106	4660	236	1864	1864	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 236, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
272	Vishvanath Pandurang Patil, Anjani Dhanaji Chorghe, Vaishali Santosh Mhatre, Pratik Tukaram Mhatre, Yuvraj Tukaram Mhatre,	Moho	100/2	Class I	490	9100	237	3640	3640	Shri. Vishvanath Pandurang Patil appeared for a hearing on 12.05.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. Their house exists	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	sr. no. 3 Soloni Tukaram Mhatre's Guardian Father Tukaram Namdev Mhatre									on the east side of the 8-meter wide existing road, adjoining Moho Lake, and therefore requested to grant them the final plot adjoining their house. Also, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 237, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
273	Group Grampanchayat Chikhale	Moho	135/0	Class I	675	3500	239	3500	3500	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The Gut No. 135/0 is a Government Land assigned to Group Grampanchayat Chikhale on certain conditions. Accordingly, Final Plot no. 239 is allotted to "Govt. of Maharashtra" and in their other rights it is mentioned that "given to Group Grampanchayat Chikhale on certain condition." Final Plot no. 239, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
274	Y. Vekant Reddy	Moho	102/3/2	Class I	501	3650	241	1460	1460	They appeared for a hearing on 08.08.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) As per sanctioned draft TPS they have been allotted the Final Plot no. 241 which is solely in the ownership of Shri. Yampalla Venkat Reddy and the Final Plot no. 243 which is in combined ownership of Shri. Namdeo Posha Mhatre and and Shri. Yampalla Venkat Reddy. Therefore, they requested to allot them the Final Plot by combining final plot no. 241 and their their share in final plot no.243. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 3.) By considering the development of the High	Gut no. 102/3/1 is Class II land & jointly owned by Namdeo Posha Mhatre and Yampalla Venkat Reddy. Gut no. 102/3/2 is class I land and owned by Yampalla Venkat Reddy. Therefore, they request to amalgamate Gut no. 102/3/2 & their share in Gut no. 102/3/1 cannot be acceded. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 241, as shown in plan no



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
275	Vishnu Parshuram Chaudhari	Shivkar	58/2	Class II	80	4200	242	1680	1680	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 242, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
276	Namdev Posha Mhatre, Yampalla Venkat Reddy	Moho	102/3/1	Class II	500	3700	243	1480	1480	Shri. Yampalla Venkat Reddy appeared for a hearing on 08.08.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) As per sanctioned draft TPS they have been allotted the Final Plot no. 241 which is solely in the ownership of Shri. Yampalla Venkat Reddy and the Final Plot no. 243 which is in combined ownership of Shri. Namdeo Posha Mhatre and and Shri. Yampalla Venkat Reddy. Therefore, they requested to allot them the Final Plot by combining final plot no. 241 and their their share in final plot no.243. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Gut no. 102/3/1 is Class II land & jointly owned by Namdeo Posha Mhatre and Yampalla Venkat Reddy. Gut no. 102/3/2 is class I land and owned by Yampalla Venkat Reddy. Therefore, they request to amalgamate Gut no. 102/3/2 & their share in Gut no. 102/3/1 cannot be acceded. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 243, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
277	Dunkur Tukaram Mhatre,	Moho	6/2/A	Class I	154	3270	247	1308	5588	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 247, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
278	Namdev Tukaram Mhatre,	Moho	41/8	Class I	249	1200		480			
279	Chandrabhaga Shankar	Moho	44/4	Class I	255	2100		840			
280	Mhatre,	Moho	46/3	Class I	266	1800		720			
281	Chahu Shankar Mhatre,	Moho	53/4	Class II	308	1600		640			
282	Ram Shankar Mhatre, Joma Shankar Mhatre, Janabai Maya Mhatre, Santosh Maya Mhatre, Raghunath Maya Mhatre, Jaydas Maya Mhatre, Kishori Kishor Gharat	Moho	89/3/1	Class I	478	1600		640			
283		Moho	89/4/2	Class I	481	2400		960			
284	Baliram Dundhya Mhatre,	Moho	89/2	Class II	477	2500	248	1000	5044	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 248, as shown in plan no
285	Sudam Dundhya Mhatre,	Moho	118/2/3		589	6000		2400			
286	Kunda Aambo Mhatre,	Moho	125/1/B		617	4110		1644			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Kailas Aambo Mhatre, Machhindra Aambo Mhatre, Sima Aambo Mhatre, Sarika Aambo Mhatre										4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
287	Shri. Shankar Deul Vahi., Madhukar Ballal Joshi, Sudhir Ballal Joshi	Moho	62	Class I	355	3200	250	1280	1280	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Final Plot no. 250, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B. It has been included in public/semi-public users.
288	Sachin Nagraj Chhajed, Harshad Savjee Dhanani, Suresh Karsanbhai Jadav, Kailash Karsanbhai Jadav, Alice Francis, Sina Mathew	Moho	56/7	Class I	319	4800	253	1920	1920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	In the sanctioned draft Scheme Gut No. 56/7, Moho was owned by Sachin Chhajed and other five. Now as per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 56/7 is subdivided into 56/7/A and 56/7/B. Therefore size of Final Plot no. 253 has been reduced and allotted for Gut no 56/7/B. Also, in draft scheme Final Plot No. 257 was granted inlieu of Gut no. 57/2 to Sachin Chhajed and other three. Now as per updated 7/12 extract, Sachin Chhajed and other three own both Gut no. 56/7/A and 57/2 and therefore combined final plot 257 has been allotted to them by increasing the size of proposed final plot no. 257 in the draft scheme. Final Plot no. 253, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
289	Prakash Ganpat Waghe	Moho	56/5	Class I	315	300	254	120	120	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 254, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
290	Bama Ganpat Dhawale	Shivkar	75/1	Class II	99	860	255	344	344	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 78/2 & 75/1, Shivkar are now totally owned by M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete. Therefore, Gut no. 75/1 & 78/2 are clubbed together with their Final Plot no. 413 in the sanctioned draft scheme and consolidated final plot no. 401 has been granted. Final Plot No. 401, as shown in plan No.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
291	Sachin Nagraj Chhajed, Harshad Savjee Dhanani, Suresh Karsanbhai Jadav, Kailash Karsanbhai Jadav	Moho	57/2	Class I	321	2600	257	1040	1040	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	In the sanctioned draft Scheme Gut No. 56/7, Moho was owned by Sachin Chhajed and other five. Now as per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 56/7 is subdivided into 56/7/A and 56/7/B. Now as per updated 7/12 extract, Sachin Chhajed and other three own both Gut no. 56/7/A and 57/2 and therefore combined final plot 257 has been allotted to them by increasing the size of proposed final plot no. 257 in the draft scheme. Final Plot no. 257, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
292	Dharma Kanya dhavale	Shivkar	320/2	Class II	128	810	258	324	324	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 258, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
293		Moho	38/2	Class II	220	500		200			
294	Muktabai Balam Bhoir, Trimbak Balam Bhoir, Raghunath Balam Bhoir, Arun Balam Bhoir, Gurunath Balam Bhoir, Suman Baburao Patil, Madhuri Trimbak Gharat	Moho	57/4/A	Class I	323	380	259	152	352	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	In the sanctioned draft Scheme Gut No. 38/2 and 57/4/A, Moho were owned by Muktabai Balam Bhoir and other six. Now as per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 38/2 is owned by Raghunath Balam Bhoir and 57/4/A is owned by Arun Balam Bhoir. Therefore, Proposed Final Plot no. 259 in draft scheme is subdivided and Final Plots no. 259A is allotted for Gut no. 57/4/A and 259B is allotted for 38/2. Final Plots no. 259A and 259B, as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
295	Aambo Gana Dhawale	Moho	57/4/B	Class I	324	420	260	168	168	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 260, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
296	Anna Khanderao Gayakwad, Nitin Raosaheb Kolape, Pandurang Shankar	Moho	56/4	Class II	314	2300	261	920	920	Shri. Nitin Ravsaheb Kolpe appeared for a hearing on 16.06.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Padalkar, Prasad Pramod Shende, Rajkumar Dhanraj Jadhav, Rajesh Hanmant Popale, Varsha Satish Kalambe, Vinod Dattatreya Kale, Virudev Narayan Gorad, Shankar Popat Gayakwad, Shrutiika Vikram Pawar, Suchita Ananda Khandekar, Sudhir Pandurang Kadam, Sanjay Anand Nanhe									sanctioned draft TPS, however, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The ownership details in form-1 are correct, however, the following grammatical corrections shall be done: i.) Anna Khanderao Gaikwad ii.) Nitin Ravsaheb Kolpe iii.) Birudev Narayan Gorad iv.) Shankar Popat Gaikwad v.) Shrutiika Vikram Pawar	Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to correction in the name of the owners, as per their request. Final Plot no. 261, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
297	Aaditya Ambo Phadke, Baby Shalikgram Phadke, Subhash Shalikgram Phadke, Sujata Digambar Khandakale, Ganu Narayan Phadke, Bhagwan Narayan Phadke, Siddharth Narayan Phadke, Vasant Narayan Phadke, Ranjna Ram Jambhulkar, Laxmi Madan Patil	Moho	113/1	Class I	545	7300	264	2920	2920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 264, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
298	Tukaram Kalu Bhoir	Moho	61/1	Class II	350	3700	265	1480	1480	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation..	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 265, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
299		Moho	61/4		353	200		80		Shri. Dasharath Ambo Patil appeared for a hearing on 18.07.23.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 70% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection
300	Dasharath Ambo Patil, Ananta Ambo Patil, Subhash Ambo Patil	Moho	61/5	Class II	354	6600	267	2640	2720	Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS, however, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 70% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00	

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 267, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
301	Valkya Gopal Phadke	Moho	113/5	Class I	549	2300	270	920	920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 270, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
302	Shri Jayprakash Denial, Shri Deepak Ganpat Koli, Shri Prakash Shridhar Tavde, Shri Raju Lalchandra Baye, Shri Vishvanath Lalchandra Baye	Moho	121/1	Class I	594	900	271	360	680	Shri. Deepak Ganpat Koli, Shri. Hemant Hiraji Patil, Shri. Prasad Hiraji Gharat appeared for a hearing on 16.06.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS, however, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 271, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
303	Shri Deepak Ganpat Koli, Deepak Babu Mhatre, Prasad Hiraji Gharat, Suryakant Narayan Bhandari, Sankesh Bama Patil, Hemant Hiraji Patil	Moho	124/2		609	800		320			
304	Ram Shankar Mhatre	Moho	121/6/A	Class I	600	1850	272	740	740	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 272, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
305	Dattatreya Balu Patil, Ganesh Balu Patil, Janabai Kashinath Bhopi, Sagunabai Sitaram Shelke, Ramdas Narayan Patil, Vasant Narayan Patil, Anandibai Narayan Patil, Rajaram Kalu Patil,	Moho	122	Class I	603	13100	275	5240	5240	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract Final Plot no. 275, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Baliram Kalu Patil, Mathura Gajanan Patil, Dnyaneshwar Gajanan Patil, Balaram Gajanan Patil, Gulab Pundalik Fulore										
306	Balkrushna Rama Patil, Madhukar Rama Patil, Ananta Rama Patil, Bebibai Tukaram Khutale, Tukaram Hari Patil, Sham Hari Patil.	Moho	4/3	Class I	146	6900	276	2760	2760	They have not appeared for a hearing. Shri. Shyam Hari Patil, Smt. Vanita Tukaram Patil, Shri. Mayur Tukaram Patil, Smt. Dhanashri Kiran Bhopi, Smt. Namrata Subhash Naik, Smt. Dharati Tukaram Patil, Shri. Balkrushna Rama Patil, Shri. Madhukar Rama Patil, Shri. Ananata Rama Patil, Smt. Bebibai Tukaram Patil submitted representation dated 03.07.2023. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 276 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 4/3 and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract Final Plot no. 276, as shown in plan no. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
307	Ramakrishna Eknath Kadav, Sachin Eknath Kadav, Shrikrishna Eknath Kadav	Moho	50/3	Class I	287	3900	277	1560	1560	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 277, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
308	Sadu Dagadu Patil, Kundalik Sitaram Patil, Bhaskar Tulsiram Patil, Bhanudas Tulsiram Patil	Moho	50/1	Class I	285	4400	278, 207A	1760	2120	They appeared for a hearing on 15.06.23 and submitted their representation dated 15.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS, however, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed.
309	Sadu Dagadu Patil, Kundalik Sitaram Patil, Bhaskar Tulshiram Patil, Bhanudas Tulshiram Patil	Moho	51/1/2		292	900		360		2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plots No. 278 & 207A, as shown in plan No. 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	
310		Moho	50/2	Class I	286	3800		1520			
311	Baburao Laxman Patil, Eknath Laxman Patil, Yamubai Dinkar Hared, Anantibai Jayram Bhagat, Barkibai Gangaram Dhavale, Jaya Lakshman Patil	Moho	59/4	Class II	338	530	279	212	1732	They have not appeared for a hearing and Shri. Eknath Laxman Patil and Shri. Baburao Laxman Patil submitted representation dated 03.07.2023. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 279 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 50/2 and adjoining lands. Their original land bearing Gut No. 50/2 is Class I land and Gut No.59/4 is Class II land. Therefore the proposed Final Plot No. 279 has been divided and Final Plot No. 279A has been granted to Gut No. 50/2 and Final Plot No. 279B has been granted to 59/4. Also, as per updated 7/12 extracts the name of the owners have been corrected. Final Plots no. 279A and 279B, as shown in plan no. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
312	Sambhaji Laxman Ghorpade, Dnyaneshwar Sitaram Devkar	Moho	124/5	Class I	612	2000	280	800	800	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 280, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
313	Revubai Rama Kadav	Moho	50/4	Class I	288	2000	281	800	800	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract Final Plot no. 281, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
314	Rukmini Pandurang Shelke, Vinayak Pandurang Shelke, Kailas Pandurang Shelke, Latifa Pandurang Shelke, Surekha Pandurang Shelke	Moho	49/4	Class II	284	2400	282	960	960	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 282, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
315		Chikhale	136/3		16	1800		720			
316	Surekha Sudhir Kulkarni, Sukhiya Sudhir Kulkarni	Chikhale	136/4	Class I	17	800	283	320	1040	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 283, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
317		Moho	4/1	Class I	144	3600	284	1440	2200		



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
318		Moho	4/2		145	600		240			
319	Gajanan Govind Patil, Kundalik Govind Patil, Sundarabai Motiram Bhopi, Janabai Shivaji Patil	Moho	45/2		258	1300		520		They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Now as per updated 7/12 extract the ownership has been changed as follows; 1.) Gut no. 4/1 - Gajanan Govind Patil. 2.) Gut no. 4/2 - Sundarabai Motiram Bhopi, Janabai Shivaji Patil. 3.) Gut no. 45/2 - Kundalik Govind Patil. Therefore, Proposed Final Plot no. 284 in the draft scheme has been subdivided and 1.) Final Plot no. 284A has been allotted for Gut no. 4/1. 2.) Final Plot no. 284B has been allotted for Gut no. 45/2. 3.) Final Plot no. 284C has been allotted for Gut no. 4/2. Final Plots no. 284A, 284B, 284C as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
320	Baliram Dunkur Patil, Pundalik Dunkur Patil	Moho	7/1	Class II	396	5500	285	2200	2200	Shri. Kunal Krushna Pat appeared for a hearing on 15.06.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS, however, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The ownership details as per form -1, are incorrect and need an updation. The Survey No. 7/1 of village Moho was earlier in the combined ownership of Shri. Baliram Dunkur Patil and Shri. Pundalik Dunkur Patil, however Shri. Pundalik Dunkur Patil has relinquished their rights from the respective survey no. wide mutation entry no. 2555 and therefore requested to grant Final Plot No. 202 in the name of Shri. Baliram Dunkur Patil. Submission in representation: 1.) Their	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. 1.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 3/3 & 52/2 are now owned by Shri. Pundalik Dinkar Patil and therefore as per their request separate Final Plot no. 202, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B. 2.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 52/6, 53/3, 57/6, 7/1 are now owned by Shri. Baliram Dunkur Patil and therefore separate Final Plot no. 285, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B. 3.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	3/4 is now owned by Janaradhan Nana More and Naresh Baburao Patil and therefore separate Final Plot no. 201A as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B. 4.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no.127/1/C is now owned by Jitendra Yugraj Jain, Mahavir Basantilal Surana, Vipul Kamal Parekh and therefore separate Final Plot no. 213, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
321	Raja Kalu Patil, Baliram Kalu Patil	Moho	7/3	Class II	399	6100	286	2440	2440	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 286, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
322	Surdas Balaram Patil	Moho	57/5	Class I	325	1100	287	440	1248	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 287, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
323		Moho	7/2A		397	2020		808			
324	Vishnu Hari Thosar	Moho	6/2/C	Class I	156	2420	288	968	968	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 288, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
325	Bhalchandra Balu Mhatre	Moho	6/2/B	Class I	155	2210	289	884	884	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 289, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
326	Rajaram Ragho Patil, Maruti Ragho Patil, Harishchandra Ragho Patil, Gomibai Shalik Patil, Navnath Shalik Patil, Jija Shalik Patil, Sugandha Shalik Patil	Moho	7/2B	Class II	398	4180	291	1672	4652	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 291, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
327		Moho	48/3		279	4100		1640			
328		Moho	73/2/D		422	3350		1340			
329		Moho	2/3 (P)	Class I	133	1015.71*		406.28			
330	Mahadev Vina Kadav, Parshuram Vina Kadav	Moho	48/1	Class I	276	7700	292	3080	5246.28	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Their original land bearing Gut No. 48/1, 52/3, 123/5 is Class I lands and Gut No. 2/3 (P) & 52/5 is Class II lands.
331		Moho	52/3	Class I	302	1900		760			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
332		Moho	52/5	Class II	304	800		320			Therefore, the proposed Final Plot No. 292 has been divided and Final Plot No. 292A has been granted to Gut No. 48/1, 52/3 & 123/5 and Final Plot No. 292B has been granted to 2/3 (P) & 52/5 Also, as per updated 7/12 extracts the name of the owners have been corrected. Final Plots no. 292A & 292B as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
333		Moho	123/5	Class I	606	1700		680			
334	Vijay Sakharam Dange, Rajesh Shankarlal Kothari.	Moho	47/3	Class I	271	4700	293	1880	1880	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 293, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
335	Vasant Narayan Patil, Rajaram Kalu Patil, Baliram Kalu Patil, Dattatreya Balu Patil, Ganu Urf Ganesh Balu Patil, Janabai Kashinath Bhopi, Sagunabai Sitaram Shelke, Sulochana Ramdas Patil, Mohan Ramdas Patil, Yashwant Ramdas Patil, Bharat Ramdas Patil, Meenakshi Motiram Mhatre, Mathura Gajanan Patil, Dnyaneshwar Gajanan Patil, Balaram Gajanan Patil, Gulab Pundalik Fullore	Moho	47/4	Class I	272	7800	294	3120	3120	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 294, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
336		Moho	47/2		270	1700		680		Shri. Yatin Sadashiv Tandel, Shri. Viraj Sandeep Mhatre, Shri. Shantanu Sandeep Mhatre appeared for a hearing on 17.05.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) Gut No. 47/2 and 124/7 of Moho Village were owned by Shri. Umesh Bhagwan Patil and 2 others and in lieu of this land, Final Plot No. 295 has been proposed in the scheme. Now Gut No. 47/2 has been purchased by Yatin Sadashiv Tandel and 2 others from Shri. Umesh Patil and 2 others wide registered purchased deed no. 2708 dated 3.3.2022 and accordingly, the	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed.
337	Umesh Bhagwan Patil, Ganesh Bhagwan Patil, Bhupesh Bhagwan Patil.	Moho	124/7	Class I	615	1300	295	520	1200		




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										names have been changed in the 7/12 extract, therefore they requested to bifurcate Final Plot No. 295 and to grant separate final plots for Gut No. 47/2 and 124/7. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	As per their request, Final Plot no. 295 has been bifurcated. For Gut no. 47/2, Final Plot no. 295A has been granted and for Gut no. 124/7, Final plot no. 295 B has been granted. Also as per their request and updated 7/12 extract, the name of owners have been changed. Final Plots No. 295 A & 295 B, as shown in plan No. 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
338	Akshay Ashok Phadke, Devyani Ashok Phadke, Omkar Ashok Phadke	Moho	47/1/2	Class I	269	2800	296	1120	1120	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 296, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
339	Arun Namdev Phadke	Moho	47/1/1	Class I	268	2700	297	1080	1080	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 297, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
340	Sachin Dharma Joshi, Swapnil Dharma Joshi,	Moho	48/2/B	Class I	278	1290	298	516	716	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 298, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
341		Moho	121/4		597	500		200			
342	Maya Narayan Shelke, Nama Narayan Shelke, Eknath Narayan Shelke, Bharat Narayan Shelke, Ganesh Narayan Shelke, Santosh Narayan Shelke, Laxmibai Rajendra Patil, Sangeeta Pundilak Phadke, Gita Nivrutti Karavkar, Mai Narayan Shelke.	Moho	45/5	Class II	261	8000	301	3200	3200	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight modification in shape and location. Final Plot no. 302, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
343	Pandurang Sitaram Pathe, Bamubai Sitaram Pathe, Kusum Dharma, Sitabai Sitaram Pathe	Moho	45/6	Class I	262	4000	302	1600	2800	Shri. Pandurang Sitaram Pathe appeared for a hearing on 16.06.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 302 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 45/6 and adjoining lands.
344		Moho	74/3	Class II	427	2700		1080			
345		Moho	76/1	Class I	438	300		120			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										their objection to include them in the said scheme.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised Final Plot no. 301 has been allotted to them. Their original land bearing Gut No. 45/6, 76/1 is Class I lands and Gut No. 74/3 is Class II land thus Final Plot no. 301 has been divided and Final Plot No. 301A has been granted to Gut No. 74/3 and Final Plot No. 301B has been granted to 45/6, 76/1. Also, as per updated 7/12 extracts the name of the owners have been corrected. Final Plot no. 301A and 301B, as shown in plan no. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
346	Kisan Dharma Patil, Alka Maruti Bhalekar, Kamal Sakham Patil, Suman Namdev Dhawale, Rakesh Prakash Patil, Dinesh Prakash Patil	Moho	47/5/A	Class I	273	1450	303	580	580	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation..	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 303, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
347	Ganesh Kana Pathe	Moho	46/1/A	Class I	263	2900	304	1160	1160	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 304, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
348	Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal, Balaram Kaluram Pathe	Moho	46/1/B	Class I	264	2500	305	1000	1000	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 305, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
349	Ganu Balu Patil	Moho	44/1	Class I	252	3000	306	1200	4240	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 306, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
350		Moho	44/2		253	1900		760			
351		Moho	59/3		337	2400		960			
352		Moho	119/2		591	3300		1320			
353	Goma Govind Mhatre	Moho	44/3	Class II	254	1600	307	640	1640	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 307, as shown in plan no
354		Moho	77/4		447	2500		1000			

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
355	Laxmibai Shyamrao Ghure, Lata Chandrakant Undage	Moho	44/5	Class I	256	2300	308	920	920	<p>They have submitted their representation on 08.05.23,</p> <p>Submission: 1.) Mrs. Lata Chandrakant Undage Stated that she owns lands at five different locations in village Moho in joint ownership with others. However, they have been granted Final Plot no. 99, 112,127,308,335 at various locations. Therefore, they requested to allot them the combined final plot on a road of larger width for better planning and for consumption of FSI. 2.) In the calculation of betterment charges, the commercial exploitation of plots available to NAINA and income to be generated against that is not taken into consideration, therefore requested to give a setback of income to be generated against these commercial plots. 3.) In the case of TPS planning, the land area of 40% is adequate for common amenities, and the balance of 60% land is to be handed over back to the owner. Thereafter All the partners of M/s Rainbow Developers, Ambadas Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde, Lata Undage and Ravindra Ghure has submitted notarised consent for considering their original land parcels in joint ownership and to provide them a single Final Plot.</p>	<p>All the partners of M/s Rainbow Developers, Ambadas Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde, Lata Undage and Ravindra Ghure has submitted notarised consent for considering their original land parcels in joint ownership and to provide them a single Final Plot. Accordingly, single Final Plot No. 127 has been granted for their original lands bearing 100/4, 102/1A, 1B, 1C, 1E, 1F, 129/3, 130/2, 130/3, 130/7, 131/1, 131/6, and 44/5 (FP No. 112, 127 and 308 in the draft sanctioned scheme.) Their original land bearing no. 128/4 is co-owned by Shri. Narayan Patil and therefore its final plot no. 99 is retained. Also, original land bearing 59/6 is co-owned by Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal & Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal and therefore its final plot no. 335 is retained. Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme.</p> <p>Final Plot no. 127 has been allotted as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.</p>
356	Suresh Rambhau Kadav, Yashwant Rambhau Kadav, Janardan Tukaram Ghogare, Dilip Tukaram Ghogre, Sunita Ganu Ghogare, Suraj Ganu Ghogare, Swapnil Ganu Ghogare, Guardian Mother Sunita Ganu Ghogare,	Moho	41/4	Class I	245	4700	309	1880	1880	<p>Shri. Janardan Tukaram Ghogare appeared for a hearing on 23.06.2023.</p> <p>Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) They requested to allow the consumption of 3.00 FSI on their final plot and if some area remains unutilized avail them TDR in lieu of the same. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal</p>	<p>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed.</p> <p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and</p>


Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) They have their home (wada) and trees in their place for which they requested to give compensation. Also, requested for Project Affected People certificate. Submission in Representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 309, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
357	Nirabai Antan Kadav	Moho	41/5	Class II	246	1100	311	440	440	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 117, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
358	Asmita Sanjay Kankariya, Devidas Anant Bhujbal	Moho	41/7	Class I	248	2200	312	880	880	Shri. Devidas Anant Bhujbal and Shri. Sanjay Kankariya on behalf of Asmita Sanjay Kankariya appeared for hearing on 22.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. They claimed that an unauthorized building existed in the allotted Final Plot No. 312 and therefore requested to either demolish the said building or they shall be granted a corner final plot at the place of Final Plot 311. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 314, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
359	Dattatreya Ghutya Shinde, Radhabai Ghutya Shinde, Janardan Gana Shinde,	Moho	41/6	Class I	247	1100	313	440	440	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 312, as shown in plan no



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Maina Jagannath Thakur, Mukta Chander Shinde, Manjula Chander Shinde, Sarika Chander Shinde										4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
360	Arvind Omprakash Agarwal	Chikhale	129/2B(P)	Class I	2	1780	315A	712	712	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract and mutation entry no. 3300, the area of Owner in Gut no. 129/2/B is 2100 sq. mt. Accordingly, the layout of the scheme has been revised and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 315, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
361	Eknath Ramdas Patil	Moho	49/3	Class I	283	2100	316	840	840	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 316, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
362	Rama Tukaram Patil, Shrikant Ramakant Rasal, Shrikrushna Ramakant Rasal	Moho	49/2	Class I	282	3000	317	1200	1200	Shri. Dattatreya Rama Patil appeared for a hearing on 23.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot. 2.) They requested to allow the consumption of 3.00 FSI on their final plot and if some area remains unutilized avail them TDR in lieu of the same. 3.) Gut No. 49/2 of Village Moho was partially owned by Shri. Rama Tukaram Patil. After his demise, his share in Gut no. 49/2 was transferred to Shri. Dattatreya Rama Patil and accordingly they requested to incorporate the name of Shri. Dattatreya Rama Patil in the ownership record of Final Plot no. 317. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) Compensation for stable and trees situated in their plot shall be granted and also provide them a Project Affected Person certificate.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 317, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
363	Prakash Nathuram Mhatre	Moho	49/1	Class I	281	6900	318	2760	2760	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 318, as shown in plan No.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
364	Geeta Chandrakant Kakade, Geeta Yadav, Nisha Shahu, Bhavna Sharma, Sarla Gehlavat, Swati Gupta	Moho	46/4	Class II	267	1800	319	720	720	They appeared for a hearing on 24.05.23 and submitted representation on 17.05.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and requested to allot them the final Plot on the road of 27M frontage, in place of Final Plot No. 305. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum 60% area of their original land. 2.) The ownership as per form -1, is incorrect and needs an updation as follows: i.) Gita Yadav ii.) Nisha Sahu iii.) Bhavna Sharma iv.) Sarla Gahlawat v.) Geeta Chandrakant Kakade vi.) Swati Gupta. 3.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. They have submitted a representation dated on 17.05.23. Submission in representation: 1.) The Original Plot is close to 27M road thus allot Final Plot close to it. 2.) While estimating the value of original Plots the value of trees, bore wells and other are negelected and shall be considered.	In the sanctioned draft TPS, final plot no.319 has been granted on 20.0 mt. wide layout road. Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to correction in the name of the owners, as per their request. Final Plot No. 318, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
365	Shruti Manik Rathod	Moho	121/6/B	Class I	601	1360	320	544	544	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 320, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
366	Vijay Sakharam Dange, Savita Chandrashekhar Burse, Santosh Prabhakarav Didore, Sandeep Narayan Gavade	Moho	58/3	Class I	331	3800	321	1520	1520	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The shape of the Final Plot no. 321 has been slightly modified and regular shape has been allotted. Final Plot no. 321, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
367	Smt. Pankaja Abhay Sanap	Moho	65/2'	Class I	364	500	321A	200	200	<p>Shri. Chandrakant Shankar Dhatrak appeared for a hearing on 22.05.2023 on behalf of Shrimati. Pankaja Abhay Sanap. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS, however, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. They submitted a representation dated 22.05.2023, Submission in representation: 1.) The final plot allotted shall at least be 50% area of the Original Plot, also the contribution amount from land owners is not acceptable as they are granting 60% of the land ownership.</p>	<p>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 60/6, Moho is also owned by Pankaja Abhay Sanap. Therefore, the said Gut no. 65/2 and 60/6 are clubbed together and combined final plot no. 342B has been allotted on 20 Mt. wide layout road. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 342B as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
368	Mahendra Motilal Banthiya	Moho	41/2	Class I	243	1100	323A	440	440	<p>They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.</p>	<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in final plot no. as 323B. Final Plot No. 323A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
369	Ganesh Chindhu Thakur, Vithabai Rama Vishe, Kalpana Dattatray Dokale, Sakhubai Baban Shinde, Anand Baban Shinde	Moho	58/1	Class II	329	1100	323	440	440	<p>Shri. Bhavesh Dilip Patil on behalf of Sunanda D. Patil, Shri. Anil Janardan Shelke on behalf of Sadhana A. Shelke and Shri. Pramod Bhagvan Patil on behalf of Payal P. Patil appeared for a hearing on 18.05.2023. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS, however, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall</p>	<p>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is</p>



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The ownership details as per form -1, are incorrect and need an updation. Survey no. 58/1 has been purchased from Ganesh Thakur and 4 others by Smt. Sunanda Dilip Patil, Smt. Sadhana Anil Shelke, Smt. Payal Pramod Patil through a registered sale deed no. 7303/2020, dated on 16/10/2020. Requesting to update the same in form 1.	confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 323B, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
370	Sheikh Ibrahim Hasan, Sheikh Abdul Qasam, Sheikh Amina Yunus, Sheikh Sharifa Adam, Sheikh Khatija Alladin, Sheikh Jaina Ajit, Sheikh Nura Kasam, Sheikh Shaida Gulam, Sheikh Siraj Gulam, Sheikh Roshni Gulam	Shivkar	61/2	Class II	84	4730	324	1892	1892	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 324, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
371	Vasant Narayan Patil	Moho	58/2	Class I	330	1400	325	560	1920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 325, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
372		Moho	59/2		336	3400		1360			
373	Dattatreya Damodar Patankar Devram Bhikaji Doke, Shrikant Shankar Rahate, Vilas Sandipan Chauhan, Mohmmad Umar Mohammad Irfan Monaria, Mohammad Saad Mohammad Irfan Monaria, Ukej Resort Pvt. Ltd.	Chikhale	135/1(P)	Class I	11	15440*	326	6176	6176	Shri. Dattatreya Damodar Patankar appeared for a hearing on 21.07.23 and submitted representation dated 09.10.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They do not accept the sanctioned draft TPS and therefore requested not to include their Original Plot no. 11 & 12 in the NAINA Scheme as well as Town Planning Scheme no. 6. Submission in representation: Survey No. 135 Village Chikhale was owned by Smt. Shantabai Patankar and Smt. Janabai Mhatre through independent 7/12 extract. Out of that 8750 sq. m. land was acquired in 15.10.1987 for Panvel By-Pass, however as the bifurcation of survey no. was not happened both the owners had taken the compensation	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. As per updated 7/12 extract the total area of Gut no. 135/1 is 18,500 sq. mt. and out of that 17,120 sq. mt. is owned by Shri. Dattatry Damodar Patankar and other three and 1380 sq. mt. is under
374	Bama Gotiram Mhatre, Krushna Gotiram Mhatre, Tulshiram Gotiram Mhatre, Eknath Gotiram Mhatre, Harishchandra Gotiram Mhatre,	Chikhale	135/2(P)	Class II	12						




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Changubai Dharma Patil, Maibai Narayan Phadke									<p>amount in equal share. Thereafter, hissa measurement of the said survey no. 135 was done on 29.05.2023 and accordingly separate 7/12 extract of 135/1 and 135/2 are formed. Accordingly, Survey no. 135/2 is totally acquired for Panvel By- Pass.</p> <p>Shri. Dnyaneshwar Eknath Mhatre and Shri. Ganesh Tulshiram Mhatre appeared for a hearing on 20.06.2023.</p> <p>Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS, however, requested to allot a separate plot for Survey No. 135/2. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The ownership details as per form -1, are incorrect and need an updation. After the demise of Shri. Harishchandra Gotiram Mhatre, his heir Shri. Bama Gotiram Mhatre, Shri. Eknath Gotiram Mhatre and Shri. Tulshiram Gotiram Mhatre became the owner of the said land and via mutation entry no. 3508, 3509, 3510, and 3606, the 7/12 extract has been updated. Accordingly requested to update the same in form 1. 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. Shri. Krushna Gotiram Mhatre submitted their representation on 20.06.2023.</p> <p>Submission in representation: 1.) The survey no. 135 of village Moho is separated by hissa no. and separate 7/12 extracts of it are available, requesting to grant a separate final plot for their survey no. Shri. Devram Bhikaji Doke and Shri. Shrikant Shankar Rahate appeared for a hearing on 19.06.23.</p>	<p>occupation of Executive Engineer Road development department. The total area of Gut no. 135/2 is 5,000 sq. mt. Also, as per Notification dated 15/2/2021 of Public Works Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1380 sq. mt. and 8750 sq. mt. out of Gut no. 135 of Chikhale Village are delcared as highway. Accordingly, the total net area of 135/1 and 135/2, retained with the owner is 13,370 sq. mt. Shri. Patankar submitted that Smt. Shantabai Patankar and Smt. Janabai Mhatre had taken the compensation amount of Panvel Bye-Pass (8750 sq. m) in equal share. Therefore, the said acquisition area is equally deducted from both Gut no. 135/1 and 135/2, and accordingly the final plots are allotted as under.</p> <p>Gut no. - Area - Area under Bye-pass - Remaining. Area - FP no. - FP Area</p> <p>135/1 - 17120 - 4375 (50% of 8750) - 12745 - 326B - 5098</p> <p>135/2 - 5000 - 4375 (50% of 8750) - 625 - 326A - 250</p> <p>Final Plot No. 326A & 326B, as shown in plan No. 4, have been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										<p>Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.</p>	
375	Amol Arvindrao Joshi	Moho	39/5	Class I	231	2400	328	960	960	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 328, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
376	Sukhdev Namdev Chavan	Moho	39/7	Class I	233	1000	329	400	400	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 329, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
377	Dynamic Developers Tarfe Partner Fakri A Hasamwaala, Ismail Javed Patel, Javed Mustafa Patel	Moho	39/6	Class I	232	2300	330	920	2200	They appeared for a hearing on 12.06.2023. Submission during the hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 330, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
378		Moho	59/1		335	3200		1280			
379	Ramesh Charya Sonawane	Moho	39/8	Class II	234	1600	331	640	1000	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per draft sanction scheme Gut no. 39/8, 60/4 & 60/5 were owned by Ramesh Sonawane and inlieu of that final plot no. 331 & 336 were proposed. As per updated 7/12 extract the ownership of the all these lands are transferred in their heirs and therefore a combined final plot no. 331 has been
380		Moho	60/4		345	900		360			




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											allotted and the name of the owners have been changed. Final Plot no. 331, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
381	Anesh Ganu Dhawale, Meenakshi Anesh Dhawale	Shivkar	62	Class I	85	1490	333	596	596	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight modification in the shape. Final Plot no. 333, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
382	Khandu Kanu Mhatre	Moho	59/5	Class II	339	3800	334	1520	1520	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 334, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
383	Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal, Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal, Ambadas Dattatreya Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde.	Moho	59/6	Class I	340	2400	335	960	960	They have submitted their representation on 08.05.23, Submission: 1.) Mrs. Lata Chandrakant Undage Stated that she owns lands at five different locations in village Moho in joint ownership with others. However, they have been granted Final Plot no. 99, 112,127,308,335 at various locations. Therefore, they requested to allot them the combined final plot on a road of larger width for better planning and for consumption of FSI. 2.) In the calculation of betterment charges, the commercial exploitation of plots available to NAINA and income to be generated against that is not taken into consideration, therefore requested to give a setback of income to be generated against these commercial plots. 3.) In the case of TPS planning, the land area of 40% is adequate for common amenities, and the balance of 60% land is to be handed over back to the owner. Thereafter All the partners of M/s Rainbow Developers, Ambadas Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde, Lata Undage and Ravindra Ghure has submitted notarised consent for considering their original land parcels in joint ownership and to provide them a single Final Plot.	All the partners of M/s Rainbow Developers, Ambadas Shinde, Madhuri Arvind Shinde, Lata Undage and Ravindra Ghure has submitted notarised consent for considering their original land parcels in joint ownership and to provide them a single Final Plot. Accordingly, single Final Plot No. 127 has been granted for their original lands bearing 100/4, 102/1A, 1B, 1C, 1E, 1F, 129/3, 130/2, 130/3, 130/7, 131/1, 131/6, and 44/5 (FP No. 112, 127 and 308 in the draft sanctioned scheme.) Their original land bearing no. 128/4 is co-owned by Shri. Narayan Patil and therefore its final plot no. 99 is retained. Also, original land bearing 59/6 is co-owned by Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal & Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal and therefore its final plot no. 335 is retained. Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. Final Plot no. 335 has been allotted as



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
384	Ramesh Charya Sonawane	Moho	60/5	Class II	346	800	336	320	320	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per draft sanction scheme Gut no. 39/8, 60/4 & 60/5 were owned by Ramesh Sonawane and inlieu of that final plot no. 331 & 336 were proposed. As per updated 7/12 extract the ownship of the all these lands are transferred in their heirs and therefore a combined final plot no. 331 has been allotted and the name of the owners have been changed. Final Plot no. 331, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
385	Dattatreya Damodar Patankar	Chikhale	146/1/A	Class I	49	4100	337	1640	3320	They appeared for a hearing on 30.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They do not accept the sanctioned draft TPS, requesting to not include their original Plot no. 49 and 50 in the NAINA Scheme as well as Town Planning Scheme no. 6.	In the sanctioned Development Plan of NAINA, their original lands bearing Gut no. 146/1/A and 146/1/B in Chikhale are under reservation of Growth Centre and therefore they have been given final plot no 337 in Moho, fronting on 20.0 mt. wide layout road. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 337, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
386		Chikhale	146/1/B		50	4200		1680			
387	Nandkumar Eknath Mumbaikar	Moho	60/3/1	Class I	343	400	338	160	160	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 336, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
388	Baba Mahadu Chaudhari, Yamuna Aatmaram Patil, Chandrabhaga Kundlik Chaudhari, Arun Kundlik Chaudhari, Premnath Kundlik Chaudhari, Sachin Kundlik Chaudhari, Manisha Kundlik Chaudhari, Somnath Kundlik Chaudhari, Bandu Parshuram Chaudhari, Vishnu Parshuram Chaudhari, Sushila	Shivkar	45	Class I	64	1720	339	688	3136	Shri. Jaydas Babu Chaudhari on behalf of Shri. Babu Mahadu Chaudhary submitted representation dated 23.02.2023. Submission in representation: 1.) In their survey no. 45/0 and 57 of village Shivkar, they have their Grampanchayat assessed house no 15 and therefore requested to grant them the final plot in the vicinity of their house.	In the sanctioned Development Plan of NAINA, their original lands bearing Gut no. 45 in Shivkar are under reservation of City Park and therefore they have been given final plot no 339 in Moho, fronting on 20.0 mt. wide layout road. Their original land bearing Gut No. 45 is Class I land and Gut No. 57 is Class II land. Therefore the proposed Final Plot No. 339 has been divided and Final Plot No. 339A has been granted to Gut No. 57 and Final Plot No. 339B has been granted to 45. Also, as per updated 7/12
389		Shivkar	57	Class II	78	6120		2448			




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Ramchandra Mundhe, Vishwanath Hasuram Patil, Rupesh Hasuram Patil, Tulshibai Raghunath Chaudhari, Maruti Raghunath Chaudhari, Hanuman Raghunath Chaudhari, Sakharan Raghunath Chaudhari, Kalpna Santosh Patil, Darshan Kashinath Patil, Archana Kashinath Patil, Prakash Pandurang Patil, Suresh Pandurang Patil, Harshal Kashinath Patil, Parvati Ramchandra Patil, Ramesh Pandurang Patil										extracts the name of the owners have been corrected. Final Plots no. 339A & 339B as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
390	Dhau Ambo Mhaskar	Moho	61/3	Class I	352	1400	340	560	560	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight modification in shape. Final Plot no. 340, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
391	Dilip Balam Gonbare, Kiran Tukaram Bhoir	Moho	61/2	Class I	351	1700	341	680	680	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and reconstituted Final Plot no. 343, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
392	Moho Garden Co.Op.Hou.Soc. tarfe Chief Promotor M.K. Fransis	Moho	57/3	Class I	322	800	343	320	3280	Shri. Santosh Namdeo Thombare, Shri. Navnath Rangnath Shendage, Shri. Kunal Navnath Shendage appeared for a hearing on 18.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) The survey no. 58/4, 58/6, and 60/1 of village Moho, were purchased by Shri. Santosh Namdeo Thombare and 7 others, Shri. Navnath Rangnath Shendage and 14 others and Shri. Kunal Navnath Shendage and 6 others. Therefore requested to allot the separate final plot for their survey no. and update the ownership details in form - 1. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum 60% area of their original land. 2) Allow them to utilize the FSI of 2.5 on their final plot. 2.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement. 1.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 58/4, 58/6, 60/1 are now owned by Shri. Santosh Namdeo Thombare and 7 others, Shri. Navnath Rangnath
393		Moho	57/7		327	600		240			
394		Moho	58/4		332	1400		560			
395		Moho	58/6		334	3400		1360			
396		Moho	60/1		341	1000		400			
397		Moho	60/6		347	1000		400			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										accepted and shall be waived off. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Shendage and 14 others and Shri. Kunal Navnath Shendage and 6 others and therefore as per their request separate Final Plot no. 311 has been allotted to them. 2.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 57/3 is now owned by Pankaja Abhay Sanap & Samrudhi Shekhar Bhujbal and therefore as per their request separate Final Plot no. 342A has been allotted to them. 3.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 57/7 is now owned by Samrudhi Shekhar Bhujbal therefore separate Final Plot no. 342C has been allotted to them. 4.) As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 60/6 & 65/2 is now owned by Pankaja Abhay Sanap and therefore combined Final Plot no. 342B has been allotted to them.
398	Rajani Jagdip Sehgal, Ankita Jagdip Sehgal.	Moho	31/2	Class I	183	13700	344, 467	5480	5480	<p>Ms. Ankita Jagdip Sehgal appeared for a hearing on 20.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.</p> <p>Shri. Bharat Jadhav, Corporator, Navi Mumbai Mahanagar Palika wide letter no. dated 002/2021/559/E-217076, dated 08.01.2021 submitted representation that Shrimati. Rajani Sehgal and Shrimati. Ankita Sehgal wide mutation entry no. 179, captured Government's Guruchan Land bearing survey no. 31/2. Area 13700 sq. m. and inlieu of that CIDCO has proposed to</p>	<p>Shri. Bharat Jadhav has not submitted any supporting document and therefore, wide letter no. लवाद/न.र.यो-६/सर्वसाधारण/२०२३/५०३ dated 19.10.2023, he was requested to submit the copy of mutation entry no. 179. As per updated 7/12 extract, Rajani Jagdip Sehgal and Ankita Jagdip Sehgal are the occupant of the gut no. 31/2, Moho Village. Also as per mutation entry no. 2126 mentioned in the 7/12 extract, Gut no. 31/2 & 43, Moho were purchased by Rajani Jagdip Sehgal and Ankita Jagdip Sehgal from Baburao Parekh. Also, mutation entry no. 179 is not mentioned in the 7/12 extract of Gut no. 31/2.</p> <p>Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed.</p>

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										allot them Final Plot no. 344 and 467, total area 5480 sq. m. Therefore they request to enquire and cancel the plot allotted to Sehegal.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in Final Plot no. Final Plots No. 344A & 467, as shown in plan No. 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
399	Shri Darshan Laxman Shelke	Moho	43	Class I	251	500	344A	200	200	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 344B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
400	Gurucharan	Shivkar	68	सरकार	92	1900	345, 385	760	12272	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot nos. 345 & 385, as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
401	Gurucharan	Shivkar	294(P)		118	28780*		11512			
402	Rohankumar Shankar Mhatre	Moho	38/5	Class I	225	1400	346	560	560	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 346, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
403	Suman Gangaram Mate	Shivkar	26/4	Class I	53	1900	347	760	760	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 347, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
404	Abdul Rahman Sheikh Ali Sheikh, Abdul Karim Sheikh Ali Sheikh, Dastgir Sheikh Ali Sheikh, Yusuf Sheikh Ali Sheikh, Hazira Sheikh Ali Sheikh, Jaibbunissa Sheikh Ali Sheikh, Amina Abbas Sheikh, Mojim Abbas Sheikh, Hamida Abbas Sheikh, Roshan Samasuddin Sheikh,	Shivkar	73	Class II	97	4480	348	1792	1792	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 348, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Faimeeda Akbar Sheikh										
405	Ketaki Rahul Anvikar	Moho	66/1/C	Class I	376	650	349	260	260	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 349, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
406	Meenakshi Anesh Dhawale	Shivkar	60	Class I	82	4380	350	1752	1752	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme have been revised for planning requirement and in lieu of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 451 as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
407	Sarala Ramchandra Sadavarte, Rahul Praksah Sadavarte, Gaurav Prakash Sadavarte, Kanchanmala Prakash Sadavarte, Rupa Prakash Sadavarte, Chandrakala Prakash Sadavarte	Moho	65/7	Class I	369	200	351	80	280	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.n.	As per latest 7/12 extract, In the other rights column of the Gut no. 66/4 name of Ganpat Rama Jadhav is mentioned as protected tenant and therefore Final Plot no. 351 B has been allotted for Gut no. 66/4 and for Gut no. 65/7 Final Plot no. 351A has been allotted. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirment and Final Plot no. 351A & 351B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
408		Moho	66/4		379	500		200			
409	Balkrishna Balaram Patil, Dhulaji Balaram Patil, Sadanand Balaram Patil	Shivkar	64	Class II	87	3240	352	1296	3928	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract the ownership has been changed. The layout of the scheme have been revised for planning requirement and in lieu of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 352 as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
410		Shivkar	79/2		108	6580		2632			
411	Sidhika Shekhar Bhujbal, Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal	Moho	41/3	Class I	244	600	353	240	2460	Shri. Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal appeared for a hearing on 22.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, they requested to allot them a combined final plot by amalgamating the final plot no. 471, 453, and 353 which are in the ownership of smt. Sandhya Shekhar bhujbal and Ms. Sadhhika Shekhar Bhujbal, on 20M wide road. 2.)	Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. As per their request final plots no. 353, 453, 471 in the sanctioned draft scheme are amalgamated and combined
412	Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal, Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal	Moho	47/5/C		275	1550		620			
413	Sidhika Shekhar Bhujbal	Moho	56/2'		312	300		120			
414	Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal, Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal	Moho	75/5/1		435	2400		960			
415	Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal, Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal	Moho	77/3		446	1300		520			

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. Shri. Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal submitted the representation dated 22.05.23. Submission in representation: 1.) The Final Plot shall at least be 50% of the original land.	final plot no. 353A has been granted. Final Plot no. 353A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
416	Pandurang Namdev Patil, Baliram Namdev Patil	Moho	75/6	Class II	437	3100	354	1240	1240	They have not appeared for hearing and Smt. Vanita Pandurang Patil submitted representation dated 26.06.23. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 354 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 75/6 and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 354, as shown in plan no. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
417	Shirish Mahadev Butala	Moho	76/3	Class I	440	7200	355	2880	2880	They have not appeared for hearing and Shri. Shirish Mahadev Butala submitted representation dated 25.09.2023. Submission in representation: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. 2.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 355, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
418	Balkrishna Ganpat Patil, Hanuman Ganpat Patil, Babu Ganpat Patil, Balaram Ganpat Patil, Datta Ganpat Patil, Janabai Mahadev Mali, Laxmibai Ganpat Patil, Nilesh Suresh Patil, Sunil Sampatrao Patil, Lina Rajaram Patil,	Chikhale	137/2	Class I	22	8700	356	3480	3480	Shri. Babu Ganpat Patil, Shri. Nilesh Suresh Patil, Smt. Lina Rajaram Patil, Smt. Sheetal Shailendra Vare appeared for a hearing on 30.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) NAINA Town Planning Scheme is not acceptable to them and requested to delete their land from the said scheme. They raised an objection to the TPS -6, requesting to keep the Original Plot no.22 in their name and not to include it in TPS- 6. 2.) Further requesting for correction in spelling mistake as	In the sanctioned Development Plan of NAINA, their original lands bearing Gut no. 137/2 in Chikhale are under reservation of Growth Centre and therefore they have been granted final plot no 356 in Moho, fronting on 30.0 mt. wide IDP road. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in shape.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Sheetal Shailendra Vare, Gandha Sachin Vare									mentioned in form -1: i.) Leena Rajaram Patil, ii.) Shital Shailendra Waray, iii.) Gandha Sachin Waray. Smt. Sheetal S. Waray submitted representation dated 30.05.22. Submission in representation: 1.) The said NAINA TPS is not proposed for any public purpose and the farmers and many social organizations have already submitted written objections against the NAINA project. Accordingly requested to delete their land-bearing survey no. 137/2, Chikhale from TPS -6.	Final Plot no. 356, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
419	Rukmini Pandurang Shelake	Moho	76/2	Class II	439	4100	357	1640	1640	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 357, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
420	Ramesh Dattu Patil	Moho	65/6	Class I	368	400	359	160	160	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 359, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
421	Sarika Chandar Shinde, Janardan Gana Shinde, Dattatreya Ghutya Shinde, Mukta Chandar Shinde, Maina Jagannath Thakur, Manjula Chandar Shinde, Radhabai Ghutya Shinde	Moho	64/6	Class I	362	1000	360	400	400	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 360, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
422	YusufKhan Akbar Khan, Alhaj M. Yakub Beg Chief Trustee, Allahbaksh Appalal Mullah, Imran Salim Khan, M. Taslim Mahmud Hussain, Yakub Beg Trust Panvel	Shivkar	316	Class I	121	3870	361	1548	1548	Shri. Vikas Mahadev Gaikwad appeared for a hearing on behalf of Mominpada Mashid Yakub Beg Trust Panvel on 22.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated extract.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Final Plot No. 361, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
423		Shivkar	46	Class I	65	2910		1164			In the sanctioned Development plan of NAINA, their original land bearing Gut no. 46 & 48/1 in Shivkar village are under reservations of Citi park and playground and therefore they have been allotted the final plot in Moho village along 20.0 mt. wide layout road. Their original land bearing Gut No. 46 is Class I land and Gut No. 48/1 is Class II land. Therefore the proposed Final Plot No. 362 has been divided and Final Plot No. 362A has been granted to Gut No. 46 and Final Plot No. 362B has been granted to 48/1. Also, as per updated 7/12 extracts the name of the owners have been corrected. Final Plots no. 362A & 362B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
424	Shankar Vitthal Patil	Shivkar	48/1	Class II	67	1110	362	444	1608	Shri. Shankar Vitthal Patil submitted representation dated 23.02.2023. Submission in representation: 1.) They have been cultivating the said land for many years and their Grampanchayat assessed house no 19 existed there. Therefore requested a grant for the final plot in the vicinity of their house,	
425	Naga Dharma Mhatre, Gana Dharma Mhatre, Hasuram Dharma Mhatre	Moho	64/1	Class II	356	4800	363	1920	1920	Shri. Baburao Naga Mhatre appeared for a hearing on 16.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They raised objection to inclusion in TPS -6. 2.) As per mutation entry no. 2409, Shri. Gana Dharma Mhatre has relinquished their rights in survey no. 64/1 of village Moho. Submission in representation 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 363 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 64/1 and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to correction in the name of the owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and final plot no. as 363A. Final Plot no. 363A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
426	Gangabai Gana Mhatre, Pradip Gana Mhatre, Lalita Nandkishor Thombare, Jayshree Santosh Mhatre	Moho	68/5	Class I	390	1200	363A	480	480	Shri. Santosh Shankar Kadav and Shri. Vitthal Hiru Mhatre appeared for a hearing on 15.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The ownership details as per Form -1 are incorrect and need an updation. As per registered sale deed no. 3588 dated 29.03.22, the survey no. 68/5 of village Moho, original area - 1200 sq. m was purchased by Mrs. Minal Mohan Patil, Mr. Vithhal Hiru Mhatre, Mrs. Shilpa Bhanudas Gaikwad, Mr. Santosh Shankar Kadav, Mrs. Aruna Santosh Kadav, Mr. Ganesh Atmaram Gharat, Mrs. Jyoti Mangesh Bhoir, Mr. Dinesh Hasuram Mhatre, Mr. Pradip Vasant Kadu, Mrs. Prabhawati Ramdas Govari, Mr. Balaram Laxman Chaudhary, Mr. Bhushan Anil Sutar.	concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners as per updated 7/12 extract and change in final plot no. as 363B. Final Plot No. 363B, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
427	Sarla Ramchandra Sadavarte	Moho	65/9A	Class I	372	1240	364	496	496	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 364, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
428	Naga Dharma Mhatre, Gana Dharma Mhatre, Hausram Dharma Mhatre	Moho	65/9B	Class I	373	260	365	104	104	Shri. Baburao Naga Mhatre appeared for a hearing on 16.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They raised objection to inclusion in TPS -6. Submission in representation 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot no. 365, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
429	Lahu Janu Patil, Shankar Janu Patil	Moho	64/5/A	Class II	360	1300	367	520	520	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot no. 367, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
430	Anita Abhay Deshpande, Narayan Aanand Shelar	Moho	87/2/C	Class I	474	2750	369	1100	1100	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 369, as shown in plan no



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
431	Namdev Mahadu Phadke, Tukaram Mahadu Phadke, Shantibai Govind Jambhulkar, Baby Mahadu Phadke, Bayjubai Nagya Bhagat, Suman Ramdas Phadke, Yogesh Ramdas Phadke, Rasika Ramdas Phadke, Kashibai Baburao Phadke, Tarabai Anna Chaudhary, Gunabai Ram Mhatre, Raman Bhai Kondilkar, Sachin Bhai Kondilkar, Reena Vishwanath Bhopi, Manda Gurunath Bhaskar, Meenakshi Somnath Chaudhary, Atmaram Rama Bhopi, Sonali Pandurang Bhopi, Sanika Pandurang Bhopi, Krishnabai Pandurang Bhopi, Geetika and Abhishek Gaurdian Mother Krishnabai Pandurang Bhopi, Karuna Chandrakant Palkar, Geetika Pandurang Bhopi, Abhishek Pandurang Bhopi, Manisha Manohar Malusare, Santosh Ananta Kathare, Sanjay Ananta Kathare, Vandana Ananta Kathare, Lakshmi Ananta Jambhale, Sita Baliram Chorghhe, Surekha Joma Chorghhe, Ragho Shankar Thombre	Shivkar	321	Class I	123	830	370	332	332	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 368, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
432	Tukaram Dattatrey Patil, Pandharinath Dattatrey Patil, Phashibai Dattatrey Patil, Lilabai Dattatrey Patil,	Moho	87/1/B	Class II	471	1760	372	704	704	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in shape Final Plot no. 371, as shown in plan no



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Shantabai Dattatrey Patil, Shantaram Dattatrey Patil, Sugandha Pandurang Patil, Surdas Dattatrey Patil, Surekha Haribhau Kurangale, Sangita Laxman Pavnekar										4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
433	Dattu Dhau Bhoir, Bhiku Dhau Bhoir, Rajubai Mahadu Bhoir, Narendra Mahadu Bhoir, Anjana Mahadu Bhoir, Anna Shankar Bhoir, Ramchandra Shankar Bhoir, Raghunath Shankar Bhoir, Subhash Shankar Bhoir	Moho	87/1/A	Class II	470	8340	373	3336	3336	<p>Shri. Sanjay Naga Bhoir appeared for a hearing on 04.08.23.</p> <p>Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The ownership details as per Form -I are incorrect and need an updation. Shri. Dattu Bhoir has granted their rights in survey no. 87/1/A to Shri. Jaydas Naga Bhoir and Shri. Sanjay Naga Bhoir, the mutation entry no. 2641 states the same. Thus requested to do a needful change in ownership of Final Plot No. 373.</p> <p>Shri. Ramchandra Shankar Bhoir, Shri. Anna Shankar Bhoir, Shri. Ragunath Shankar Bhoir, Shri. Subhash Shankar Bhoir submitted representation dated 31.07.23.</p> <p>Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.</p>	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 372, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
434	Dilip Rama Dhawale, Parvatibai Rama Dhawale, Trimbak Rama Dhawale,	Shivkar	65	Class II	88	6270	376	2508	2508	<p>Shri. Vishal Kulkarni appeared for a hearing on behalf of M/s. Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd on 29.05.23.</p>	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd Director Narendra Hete									<p>Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and requested to allot a separate final plot for their holding in survey no. 65. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.</p>	<p>the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed.</p> <p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 376, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
435	Shevanti Namdev Bhagat, Sunil Namdev Bhagat, Anil Namdev Bhagat, Rajashri Namdev Bhagat, Jayashri Namdev Bhagat, M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete	Shivkar	71	Class I	95	4200	377	1680	1680	<p>Shri. Vishal Kulkarni appeared for a hearing on behalf of M/s. Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd on 29.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and request to allot a separate final plot for their holding in survey no. 65. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.</p>	<p>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed.</p> <p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 377, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
436	Santosh Dharma Bhoir, Khandu Dharma Bhoir	Moho	86/4	Class II	469	8600	378	3440	3440	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 378, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
437	Sangeeta Kavlya Bhoir, Vasantibai Maruti Gharat,	Moho	85/2	Class II	465	5400	380	2160	3900	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 380, as shown in plan no</p>
438	Bhau Kavlya Bhoir, Ayatubai Gopinath Mhatre,	Moho	87/2/B		473	4350		1740			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Hirabai Eknath Waghmare, Laxmibai Hiraji Waghmare, Dwarkabai Gajanan Patil										4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
439	Vitthal Goma Bhoir, Ghanshyam Avadharaj Yadav, Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal	Moho	85/1	Class II	464	12200	381	4880	4880	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot no. 381, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
440	Mominpada Mashid Yakub Beg Trust Panvel for Trust, Alhaj M. Mustapha Yakub Beg, Abdul Gafar A. Sattar Shaikh Trustee, Abdulla Badwan Kunni Trustee, Akil Jafar Khan Trustee, Iqbal Aliyar Khan Trustee	Moho	70/3	Class I	402	2600	382, 546	1040	3600	Shri. Vikas Mahadev Gaikwad appeared for a hearing on behalf of Mominpada Mashid Yakub Beg Trust Panvel on 22.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to allot a combined+- Final Plot for better development. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. Shri. Narendra Urf Narayan Mhatre, Shri. Narayan Posha Mhatre, Shri. Sharad Kisan Mhatre submitted their representation on 21.06.2023, 22.06.2023 & 26.06.2023 respectively. Submission in representation: 1.) They are the tenants in Gut no. 70/3, 74/2, 86/3, 87/3 and the said lands are under occupation of them. Submission during Combined hearing dated 29.08.2023. 1.) In the 7/12 extract of Gut no. 86/3, 87/3, 70/3, 74/2 their names are included in other rights as tenants. They are cultivating the said land and for that they are paying amount to the Yakub beg trust therefore they requested	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership as per updated 7/12 extract. Final plots no. as 382B & 546, as shown in plan No. 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
441		Moho	74/2		426	2400		960			
442		Moho	86/3		468	3300		1320			
443		Moho	87/3		475	700		280			




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										to grant 60% share in the final plot granted in lieu of teh original lands.	
444	Laxmibai Vishnu Thosar, Madhav Vishnu Thosar, Rohini Yashavant Godase, Vijay Vishnu Thosar, Purushottam Vishnu Thosar	Moho	86/2	Class I	467	600	383	240	240	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot no. 383, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
445	Ganubai Hanuman Gharat, Nirmala Dhondu Mhatre, Ramabai Mahadev Popeta, Shantaram Dhondu mhatre, Nama Dhondu mhatre	Moho	76/4	Class I	441	3400	384	1360	1360	Shri. Arvind Totaram Wankhede, Vice-President of Shri Mangalam Cooperative Housing Society appeared for a hearing on 22.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) The ownership details as per form-1, need an updation, survey no. 76/4 was purchased by Shri Mangalam Sahakari Gruhnirman Sanstha Ltd. on 19.07.2021.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 384, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
446	Dilip Narayadas Gurbani, Ghanshyam A. Yadav	Moho	77/1	Class I	443	2100	386	840	840	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 386, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
447	Balaram Shankar Kadav	Moho	58 /7	Class I	328	400	387	160	2360	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot no. 387, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
448		Moho	60/7		348	500		200			
449		Moho	72/5		416	2900		1160			
450		Moho	76/5		442	1100		440			
451		Moho	77/2/2		445	1000		400			
452	Rama Janu Gaykar	Chikhale	130/1A(P)	Class II	3	10610*	388	4244	4244	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The part area of original land bearing 130/1, measuring 290 sq. m. is partially affected by Mumbai Pune expressway and the remaining area is 10610 sq. m.
453	Gulab Mohammed Rajjak, Asar Phunis Gulab Rasul Mo. Rajjak,	Chikhale	130/1B(P)	Class I	4						




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Mohammed Nain Sheikh Mohammed Shadril, Sudel Mohammed Sheikh Mohammed Shadril										However, as the Hissa measurement of said Gut no. 130/1A, 1B, and 1K is not available, combined Final Plot no. 390 has been allotted. According to the holding of each family in the said Gut no., their share in final plot has been finalized as under. Gut No. -130/1A - Share of Jankubai Rama Gaikar and other - 12.84 % Gut No. -130/1A - Share of Aggrawal - 20.18 % Gut No. -130/1B - Share of Gulab Rasul Mohammad Rajjak - 33.95 % Gut No. -130/1C - Share of Kamlakar Kamrya Gaikar and other - 33.03 % The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 390, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
454	Kamlakar Kamrya Gaykar, Jijabai Ramkrushna Shelke, Taibai Sudam Patil, Latabai Sudam Patil, Vanita Vitthal Gaykar, Anil Vitthal Gaykar, Sneha Vitthal Gaykar, Guna Arjun Gaykar, Ganesh Arjun Gaykar, Balaram Arjun Gaykar, Balkrushna Arjun Gaykar, Pramila Arjun Gaykar	Chikhale	130/1K(P)	Class II	5						
455	Dattatrey Ghutya Shinde, Radhabai Ghutya Shinde	Moho	77/5	Class II	448	3900	389	1560	4400	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation..	The location of proposed Final Plot no. 389 has been slightly shifted to southern side on the same road. Final Plot no. 389, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
456		Moho	81/4		460	7100		2840			
457	Ganesh Damodar Shelke	Moho	81/1/A	Class I	456	4550	390	1820	3680	They appeared for a hearing on 20.06.23. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have three lands at Moho bearing Gut no. 120/5, 81/1/A, and 81/1/B and have been given final plot no. 119 and 390 at different locations. They requested to grant a combined square-shaped final plot for their total holding at the place of Final Plot no. 390. Also, they requested to grant a Final Plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 80% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. As per their request, their three lands bearing Gut No. 120/5, 81/1/A, & 81/1/B are clubbed together (Final Plot no. 119 & 390 in sanction draft scheme) and combined Final Plot no 116 has been allotted. Final Plot No. 116, as shown in plan No.
458		Moho	81/1/B	Class I	457	4650		1860			


Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
459	Rama Padu Patil, Narayan Padu Patil, Gaurubai Damu Patil, Fashibai Manglya Dhavale, Kanubai Nathuram Kalambe, Radhabai Padu Patil, Balu Ragho Patil, Ashok Kaluram Patil, Dharma Kaluram Patil, Laxmi Kaluram Patil, Darshana Dattatray Patil, Arun Kaluram Patil, Ashwini Sachin Kadu, Manda Bhagwan Patil, Lahu Mahadu Mhaskar, Krishnabai Lahu Shelke, Sachin Pandurang Mhaskar, Ankush Mahadu Mhaskar, Sunita Arun Gayakar, Sagar Pandurang Mhaskar, Santosh Pandurang Mhaskar, Ganesh Mahadu Mhaskar, Madhukar Mahadu Mhaskar, Harishchandra Mahadu Mhaskar, Manisha Kashinath Patil, Somnath Kashinath Patil, Akanksha Ashok Bhoir, Pranita Pramod Patil, Rupali Kashinath Patil, Supriya Kashinath Patil	Shivkar	315	Class II	120	9760	391	3904	3904	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot no. 391, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
460	Aaytubai Gopinath Mhatre, Bhau Kavlya Bhoir, Laxmibai Hiraji Waghmare, Vasantibai Maruti Gharat, Dwarkabai Gajanan Patil, Sangita Kavlya Bhoir, Hirabai Ekanath Waghmare	Moho	81/5	Class II	461	1900	393	760	760	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot no. 393, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
461	Gotiram Kamalu Dhavale, Ramchandra Kamalu Dhavale	Shivkar	39/0	Class II	55	8020	394	3208	3208	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 394, as shown in plan no




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
462	Namdev Ragho Bhoir, Housabai Lahu Mali, Dnyandev Nama Bhoir	Moho	82/1	Class II	462	21500	397	8600	8600	They have not appeared for a hearing. Shri. Vithhal Namdev Bhoir submitted their representation dated 26.06.23, Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 397 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 82 and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in shape. Final Plot no. 397, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
463	Gana Ganpat Tupe, Gunabai Ganu Jale, Baraki Tukaram Dhavale, Kashi Gurunath Kadav, M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete.	Shivkar	44/1	Class II	60	12170	399	4868	4868	Shri. Vishal Kulkarni appeared for a hearing on behalf of M/s. Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. on 29.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. Request to allot a separate final plot for their holding in survey no. 44/1. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	They are co-owners in their original Gut no. 44/1 and therefore their request to grant a separate final plot can not be considered. Also considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot No. 399, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
464	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete, Praveen Narayan Kamble	Shivkar	78/2	Class I	105	2000	400	800	800	Shri. Vishal Kulkarni appeared for a hearing on behalf of M/s. Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. on 29.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. Request to allot a separate final plot for their holding in survey no.78/2. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 78/2 & 75/1, Shivkar are now totally owned




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	by M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete. Therefore, Gut no. 75/1 & 78/2 are clubbed together with their Final Plot no. 413 in the sanctioned draft scheme and consolidated final plot no. 401 has been granted. Final Plot No. 401, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
465	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete.	Shivkar	58/1	Class I	79	4150	401	1660	1660	Shri. Vishal Kulkarni appeared for a hearing on behalf of M/s. Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. on 29.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 400, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
466	Vishnu Bhama Bhoir	Moho	81/3	Class II	459	5000	402	2000	2000	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership & slight change in the location. Final Plot no. 402, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in Table B.
467	Dunkur Dharma Bhoir, Rama Dharma Bhoir, Dinkar Dharma Bhoir, Baby Dharma Bhoir, Barki Dharma Bhoir	Moho	81/2	Class II	458	6100	403	2440	2440	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation..	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in the location. Final Plot no. 403, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
468	Dattatreya Damodar Patankar, Nitin Narayan Gaikwad, Yogesh Narayan Gaikwad	Chikhale	146/2	Class I	51	3700	404	1480	1480	Shri. Dattatreya Damodar Patankar, Shri. Nitin Narayan Gaikwad appeared for a hearing on 30.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They raised an objection to the TPS -6 and requested to keep	In the sanctioned development plan of NAINA, their original land bearing Gut no. 146/2 of village Chikhale is under the reservation of Growth Centre and therefore they have been granted the



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										the Original Plot no. 22 in their name and not to include it in TPS- 6.	final plot in village Moho fronting on 20.0 mt. wide layout road. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 404, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
469	Shankar Ganu Mhatre	Moho	78/4	Class I	453	2000	405	800	2880	Shri. Shankar Ganu Mhatre appeared for a hearing on 13.07.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the allotted final plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. They own survey no. 78/4, 104/5/1, 106/3/A, and 132/6 and in lieu of that they have been granted FP 405. Their residential house exists in Survey No. 106/3/A and the said land is proposed for final plot no.44 and allotted to Shri. Shailendra Bhand. Therefore, they requested that the final plot for survey no. 106/3/A shall be granted around their structure therein and for remaining lands they shall be granted FP in survey no. 78/4. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum 60% area of their original land. 2.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. Submission during the combined hearing of FP 44 and FP 405: i.) Gut No. 106/3/B, Moho is owned by Shri. Shailendra Bhand and in lieu of that FP 44 has been proposed. However, in place of FP 44, there are 3 residential structures of Shri. Shankar Ganu Mhatre (Proposed owner of FP 405). Therefore, Shri. Shailendra Bhand has requested that FP 44 be granted to Shri. Shankar Ganu Mhatre and they Shall be granted FP 45 which is reserved for amenity space. ii.) They sold Survey No. 78/4 to Shri. Patwardhan and therefore they requested that the final plot for survey no. 106/3/A shall be granted around their structure therein and a	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. As per their request, for Gut no. 106/3/A, Final plot no. 44 has been granted in the said land surrounding their structure. For Gut no. 104/5/1 and 132/6, Final plot no. 425 has been granated and for Gut no. 78/4, Final plot no. 406 has been granted. Final Plots No. 44 , 425, & 406, as shown in plan No. 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
470		Moho	104/5/1	Class I	513	1700		680			
471		Moho	106/3/A	Class II	522	2100		840			
472		Moho	132/6	Class I	669	1400		560			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										separate final plot shall be granted for survey no. 104/5/1 and 132/6.	
473	Sakharam Ganapat Mhatre, Rasika Nivrutti Mhatre, Punam Tukaram Mhatre	Moho	78/2	Class II	450	1990	407	796	796	<p>Shri. Pritam Janardan Deshmukh and Shri. Sunil Shantaram Waghmare appeared for a hearing on 27.06.23.</p> <p>Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) The ownership details as per form-1 are incorrect and need an updation. Survey No. 78/2 of village Moho was purchased by i.) Prabhakar Narayan Patil, ii.) Pritam Janardan Deshmukh, iii.) Vinod Prabhakar Patil, iv.) Sudhir Jaganath Koli, v.) Sunil Shantaram Waghmare, vi.) Suryakant Atmaram Thakur, vii.) Santosh Shankar Kadav, viii.) Janardan Tukaram Patil, ix.) Dynaneshwar Sudhakar Bhoir, x.) Nilesh Anant Tandel from Sakharam Ganapat Mhatre, Rasika Nivrutti Mhatre, Punam Tukaram Mhatre, the same is reflected in the 7/12 extract following the Mutation entry no. 2529. 3.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.</p>	<p>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in shape & change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract.</p> <p>Final Plot No. 407, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
474	Bhama Dattu Mhatre, Suvarna Chandrakant Tambade, Aruna Umesh Patil, Karuna Anil Bhalekar, Puja Dattu Mhatre, Rina Dattu Mhatre	Moho	78/1	Class I	449	3400	408	1360	1360	<p>They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.</p>	<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in shape.</p> <p>Final Plot no. 408, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
475	Vitthal Goma Bhoir	Moho	78/3/A	Class I	451	3150	409	1260	1260	<p>Smt. Sunita Sudhakar Mahajan appeared for a hearing on 09.05.2023.</p> <p>Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. 2.) The ownership</p>	<p>As per updated 7/12 extract ownership is changed.</p> <p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and inlieu of this revised reconstituted Final</p>



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										details as per form -1, need an updation. 3.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Plot no. 412, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
476	Balaram Ganpat Jadhav, Manjula Maruti Rokade, Sarika Santosh Kadam, Bharati Sandip Bhoir, Sugandha Harishchadra Jadhav	Moho	73/4	Class II	424	500	410	200	200	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 410, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
477	Ramesh Charya Sonawane, Amol Namdev Bhagat, Sarika Atul Bhagat	Moho	79/2	Class II	455	5900	411	2360	2360	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and inlieu of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 411, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
478	Bharat Mulji Khona	Moho	79/1	Class I	454	9700	412	3880	3880	They appeared for a hearing on 30.05.2023. Submission during Hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS, but requested the shape to be rectangular. Also, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and inlieu of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 409, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
479	M/s Valuable Properties Pvt. Ltd.	Shivkar	38	Class I	54	4700	413	1880	23516	Shri. Vishal Kulkarni appeared for a hearing on behalf of M/s. Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. on 29.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered.
480	M/s. Valuable Properties pvt. Ltd.	Shivkar	41		57	4430		1772			

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06										Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area			
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
481	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete.	Shivkar	42		58	6100		2440		accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 78/2 & 75/1, Shivkar are now totally owned by M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete. Therefore, Gut no. 75/1 & 78/2 are clubbed together with their Final Plot no. 413 in the sanctioned draft scheme and consolidated final plot no. 401 has been granted. Final Plot No. 401, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.	
482	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete.	Shivkar	47		66	14870		5948				
483	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete.	Shivkar	54/1		74	2580		1032				
484	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete.	Shivkar	56		77	2880		1152				
485	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete.	Shivkar	63		86	2830		1132				
486	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete.	Shivkar	67		91	4200		1680				
487	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete	Shivkar	70		94	4580		1832				
488	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. Director Narendra Hete.	Shivkar	76		102	1370		548				
489	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd.	Moho	56/1		311	1000		400				
490	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd.	Moho	64/4		359	1600		640				
491	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd.	Moho	65/8B		371	850		340				
492	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd Director Narendra Hete	Moho	72/2		413	3600		1440				
493	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd.	Moho	73/3		423	1800		720				
494	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd.	Moho	86/1		466	1400		560				
495	Beena Khot	Moho	78/3/B	Class II	452	1350	414	540	540	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 414, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.	
496	Vivek Dnyaneshwar Patil, Narayan Padu Patil, Gaurubai Damu Patil, Fashibai Manglya Dhawale, Kanubai Nathuram Kalambe, Radhabai Padu	Shivkar	49	Class I	69	3200	415	1280	1280	Shri. Vishal Kulkarni appeared for a hearing on behalf of M/s. Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. on 29.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and requested to allot a	They are co-owners in their original land bearing Gut no. 49 and therefore their request to grant a separate final plot can not be considered. Also considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot	


Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Patil, Balu Ragho Patil, Rama Padu Patil, Ashok Kaluram Patil, Dharma Kaluram Patil, Lakshmi Kaluram Patil, Darshana Dattatray Patil, Arun Kaluram Patil, Ashwini Sachin Kadu, Manda Bhagwan Patil, Lahu Mahadu Mhaskar, KrishnaBai Lahu Shelke, Sachin Pandurang Mhaskar, Ankush Mahadu Mhaskar, Sunita Arun Gaikar, Sagar Pandurang Mhaskar, Santosh Pandurang Mhaskar, Ganesh Mahadu Mhaskar, Madhukar Mahadu Mhaskar, Harishchandra Mahadu Mhaskar, Manisha Kashinath Patil, Somnath Kashinath Patil, Akanksha Ashok Bhoir, Pranita Pramod Patil, Rupali Kashinath Patil, Supriya Kashinath Patil, M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd Director Narendra Hete									separate final plot for their holding in survey no. 49. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot No. 415, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
497	Zipa Budhya Patil	Shivkar	54/2	Class I	75	3890	417	1556	1556	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot No. 417, as shown in plan no 4 has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
498	Dattatreya Ganu Dhavale	Moho	72/3	Class I	414	4100	418	1640	1640	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 418, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
499	Sakharam Balu Shinde, Sitaram Halya Shinde, Tukaram Ladku Shinde, Archana Machhindra Thombare, Darshan Machhindra Thombare,	Moho	72/1	Class II	412	3000		1200	2040	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and inlieu of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 419, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
500		Moho	72/4		415	2100	419	840			




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Bhavika Machhindra Thombare, Harshada Machhindra Thombare, Sujita Subhash Patil, Gaurdian Mother Archana Thombare, Mathura Sudam Aagivale, Shobha Damodar Bhalekar, Yamuna Shantaram Badekar, Surekha Suresh Thakur, Gulab Arun Bolade										
501		Moho	114/1/3	Class II	555	1300		520			
502	Sarvaram Nama Kadav	Moho	114/5	Class I	560	2500	420	1000	1520	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement. Their original land bearing Gut No. 114/5 is Class I land and Gut No. 114/1/3 is Class II land. Therefore Final Plot No. 426A has been granted to Gut No. 114/5 and Final Plot No. 426C has been granted to 114/1/3. Also, as per updated 7/12 extracts the name of the owners have been corrected. Final Plots no. 426A & 426C, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
503	Narayan Balkrishna Pandit, Dilip Balkrishna Pandit, Arun Balkrishna Pandit, Shantabai Balkrishna Pandit	Chikhale	139/1	Class II	28	3900	421	1560	1560	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract ownership is changed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in lieu of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 421, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
504	Sitabai Janu Patil, Balaram Janu Patil, Chandrakant Janu Patil, Saraswati Ganesh Mhaskar, Fashibai Janu Patil, Manisha Devendra Patil, Rekha Santosh Bhagat	Shivkar	66/2	Class I	90	3950	422	1580	1580	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation..	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and inlieu of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 422, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
505	Narayan Hari Nakhwa	Moho	73/2/C	Class I	421	3690	423	1476	1476	They have not appeared for a hearing. Shri. Shankar Ganu Mhatre submitted a letter dt. 18.07.23. Submission: 1.) Final Plot No. 423 has been proposed in lieu of Survey No. 73/2/C in the name of Shri. Narayan Hari Nakhwa.	As per updated 7/12 extract ownership is updated. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in lieu of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 423, as shown in plan no 4, has




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										However, in the other right side of the 7/12 extract, the name of Shri. Shankar Ganu Mhatre has been mentioned as a Protected Tenant. 2.) The total area of survey no. 73/2/C is 3690 sq. m. and Additional tahsildar and Agriculture Tribunal, wide order dated 28.06.1969, had fixed the land amount under section 32 G of Maharashtra Tenancy and Agricultural Land Act, 1948 for 3100 sq. mt. land. For the remaining 590 sq.m m land the application dated 23.08.2019 was submitted for fixation of land amount under section 32 G of the Maharashtra Tenancy and Agricultural Land Act, 1948. Therefore, they requested not to grant the FP 423 in the name of Shri. Narayan Hari Nakhwa.	been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
506	Maruti Ganpat Gadkari, Mangal Ganpat Gadkari	Chikhale	138/1B	Class I	26	4600	424	1840	1840	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and inlieu of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 424A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
507	Kashinath Pandurang Shinde,	Moho	70/5	Class II	404	1800	427	720	1520	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in final plot no. as 427C. Final Plot no. 427C, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
508	Bala Pandurang Shinde, Ramchandra Pandurang Shinde, Somi Balaram labade	Moho	82/2		463	2000		800			
509	Balya Dhaku Phadke	Moho	120/4	Class I	592	3900	428	1560	1560	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 428, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
510	Parvati Mahadu Mhaskar	Moho	70/2	Class II	401	2200	430	880	880	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation..	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 430, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
511	Ananta Hasha Sonawane,	Moho	45/3	Class II	259	1400	431	560	3920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation..	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 431, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
512	Vasant Hasha Sonawane,	Moho	66/6		381	800		320			
513	Madhukar Hasha Sonawane,	Moho	71/1		406	2200		880			
514	Nirmalabai Jayant Yelve,	Moho	71/3		408	2200		880			
515	Sakhubai Dashrath Sonawane,	Moho	71/5		410	900		360			
516	Sonawane,	Moho	75/1		431	1200		480			
517	Sujata Dashrath Sonawane	Moho	75/3		433	1100		440			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
518	Sakharam Balu Shinde, Gulab Arun Bolade, Sitaram Halya Shinde	Moho	69/2	Class II	392	4600	433	1840	1840	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 433, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
519	Vasant Nama Dhawale, Narayan Nama Dhawale, Ganu Padu Dhawale, Shantabai Narayan Patil, Ambaji Dhamba Dhawale, Manisha Kashinath Patil, Sitabai Kamalu Dhawale, Kanibai Harishchandra Patil, Pandurang Dhamba Dhawale, Mahadaya Dhamba Dhawale, Balya Dhamba Dhavale, Anandi Dhamba Dhavale, Bhuri Dhamba Dhavale, Tara Kana Patil	Shivkar	314/B	Class II	125	4330	434	1732	1732	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation..	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 434, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
520	Sarvaram Shankar Mhatre	Moho	67/2	Class II	384	600	435	240	240	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 435, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
521	Krushna Namdev Patil, Santosh Namdev Patil	Moho	74/4	Class II	428	6000	436	2400	2400	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 436, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
522	Mahadev Goma Topale, Ramabai Chandrakant Topale, Ashok Chandrakant Topale, Kishor Chandrakant Topale, Kiran Chandrakant Topale	Shivkar	78/1	Class II	104	4200	437	1680	1680	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot no. 437, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
523	Ramchandra Kanha Sonawane,	Moho	74/6	Class I	430	4000	438	1600	1880	They have not appeared for hearing and not submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot no. 438, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
524	Janardan Kanha Sonawane, Sanjay Kanha Sonawane, Sushila Prakash Khambe, Kalpana Chandrakant Khambe	Moho	75/2		432	700		280			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
525	Vishnu Ramkrishna Bhat	Moho	75/4	Class I	434	4000	439	1600	1600	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot no. 439, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
526	Dnyaneshwar Madhukar Dhawale, Mangesh Madhukar Dhavale, Ramdas Kashinath Mhatre	Shivkar	319/1	Class I	126	3080	440	1232	1232	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 440, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
527	Ketaki Rahul Anvikar, Sushant Dhondiram Mhatre, Darshan Dinkar Mhatre	Moho	72/6	Class I	417	1800	442	720	720	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 442, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
528	Gomibai Dinkar Gawand, Indubai Shankar Patil, Maribai Changa Dhawale, Devkibai Changa Dhawale, Ganga Kamalu Dhawale, Dattatreya Kamalu Dhawale, Damodar Kamalu Dhawale, Hoshi Parashuram Mhatre, Anil Kamalu Dhawale, Umesh Dhaya Dhawale, Ganesh Kamalu Dhavale, Mahadev Kamalu Dhavale, Anandi Ganya Dhavale, Avinash Dhaya Dhavale, Anibai Dhaya Dhavale, Rekha Ramchandra Bhagat, Mai Prakash Shelke	Shivkar	314/A	Class II	124	4470	443	1788	1788	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 443, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
529	Fashi Namdev Patil	Shivkar	104	Class I	117	5000	444	2000	2000	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 444, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
530	Mahmad Ibrahim Sheikh, Mahamood Mia Ibrahim Sheikh, Qadir Ibrahim Sheikh, Mariam Abraham Sheikh, Alimiya Ibrahim Shaikh	Shivkar	61/1	Class II	83	1040	446	416	416	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 446, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
531	Dhaya Ambo Mhaskar, Mahadu Ambo Mhaskar, Hira Ambo Mhaskar, Gana Ambo Mhaskar, Guna Bama Mhaskar, Nami Ambo Mhaskar, Hashibai Ambo Mhaskar, Chandrabhagha Kundalik Mhaskar, Rajendra Kundalik Mhaskar, Ram Kundilak Mhaskar, Sachin Kundilak Mhaskar, Nitin Kundilak Mhaskar	Moho	69/1	Class II	391	2800	448	1120	1120	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 448, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
532	Deepak Walaji Karia, M/s. Choice Buildcon LLP behalf partner	Moho	28/2/A	Class I	171	4900	449	1960	4240	Shri. Deepak Valaji Karia for M/s. Choice Buildcon LLP behalf partner and Shri. Harnish Dharmendra Karia Partners thro' M/s Choice Reality appeared for hearing on 30.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot. Bhuriraj Choice Realtors Limited is their sister company and therefore they requested to grant their Final Plots adjoining to Final Plots allotted to M/s Bhuriraj Choice Realtors Limited bearing FP no. 484, 485, 494, and 562 and fronting on 60M wide Spine Road, for better development. Also, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in the shape. Final Plot no. 449, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
533		Moho	29/3B		177	1800		720			
534		Moho	68/2		387	3900		1560			
535	Harnish Dharmendra Karia Partners thro' M/s Choice Reality	Pali Khurd	21/1(P)	Class I	708	4686*	450	1874.40	1874.40	Shri. Deepak Valaji Karia for M/s. Choice Buildcon LLP behalf partner and Shri. Harnish Dharmendra Karia Partners thro' M/s Choice Reality appeared for hearing on 30.05.23,	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										<p>Submission: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot. Bhumi Raj Choice Realtors Limited is their sister company and therefore they requested to grant their Final Plots adjoining to Final Plots allotted to M/s Bhumi Raj Choice Realtors Limited bearing FP no. 484, 485, 494, and 562 and fronting on 60M wide Spine Road, for better development. Also, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.</p>	<p>regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. As per joint measurement statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 21/1-10520 sq. mt. the area of 5830 sq. mt. was acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 4690 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of 1876 sq. mt. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in the shape and area as per the Joint Measurement Sheet of Multi Modal Corridor Acquisition. Final Plot no. 450, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
536	Maruti Ganpat Gadkari	Chikhale	139/6	Class I	33	2100	451	840	840	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 459, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
537	Sham Laxman Katore, Sanjivani Suresh Katore	Moho	74/1	Class I	425	1900	452	760	760	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract ownership is changed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in shape and final plot number. Final Plot no. 453, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
538	Shekhar Namdeo Bhujbal, Sandhya Namdeo Bhujbal	Moho	67/1/2	Class I	383	4700	453	1880	1880	<p>Shri. Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal appeared for a hearing on 22.05.23.</p> <p>Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, they requested to allot them a combined final plot on a 20M wide road by amalgamating the final plot no. 471, 453, and 353, which are in the ownership of Smt. Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal and Ms. Sadhika Shekhar Bhujbal.</p>	<p>Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. As per their request final plots no. 353, 453, 471 in the sanctioned draft scheme are amalgamated and combined</p>




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. Shri. Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal submitted the representation dated 22.05.23. Submission in representation: 1.) The Final Plot shall be at least 50% of the original land.	final plot no. 353 has been granted. Final Plot no. 353A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
539	Pundalik Urf Kundalik Ganya Bhoir, Anant Kokya Naik, Jayendra Kokya Naik.	Moho	38/4/B	Class I	224	3780	454	1512	1512	They have not appeared for hearing and Shri. Pundalik urf Kundalik Ganya Bhoir submitted representation dated 26.06.23, Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 454 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 38/4 and adjoining lands. As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 38/4/B has been divided into new Gut no. 38/4B/1 & 38/4B/2. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted FP no. 455A has been allotted to gut no. 38/4B/2 & FP no. 455B has been allotted to gut no. 38/4B/1. Final Plots no. 455A & 455B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
540	Chadrakant Rama Bhoir, Ramakant Rama Bhoir, Vimal Ganpat Bhopi, Nirabai Kisan Bhopi, Hirabai Ajay Mhatre, Malatibai Muralidhar Karlekar	Moho	38/4/A	Class II	223	2620	455	1048	1048	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	AS per updated 7/12 extract ownership is changed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in shape and final plot number. Final Plot No. 456, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
541	Janu Narayan Dhavale, Changa Narayan Dhavale, Dhondibai Rama Patil, Janabai Kalya Shelake, Shantabai Parshuram Chaudhari,	Shivkar	48/2	Class II	68	2330	456	932	932	Shri. Sandesh Kanha Dhawle appeared for a hearing on 23.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area	As per updated 7/12 extract ownership is changed. Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Dattatrey Budhaji Dhavale, Sanjay Budhaji Dhavale, Hirabai Ragho Patil, Nirabai Haribhau Patil, Tarabai Maruti Chaudhari, Pushpa Dyaneshwar Patil, Baraki Ravindra Thakur									of their original land. 2.) As per mutation entry no. 2717 in Survey No. 48/2 of Village Shivkar, after the demise of co-holder Shri. Janu Narayan Dhawle, the following names of their heirs have been added: i.) Shri. Kanha Janu Dhawle, ii.) Shri. Lahu Janu Dhawle, iii.) Vithhabai Motiram Dhawle, iv.) Hashibai Shantaram Chaudhari, v.) Jijabai Tukaram Phadke, vi.) Vanita Maya Patil. Accordingly requested to update the same. 3.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 454, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
542	Sachin Omprakash Agrawal	Chikhale	138/2	Class I	27	6000	457	2400	5204	Shri. Akash S. Agrawal appeared for hearing on 24.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in shape. Final Plot No. 457, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
543	Aakash Sachin Agrawal	Moho	32/5		190	1800		720			
544	Aakash Sachin Agrawal	Moho	36/5/B		211	2960		1184			
545	Aakash Sachin Agrawal	Moho	121/5/B	Class I	599	2250	457	900	5204	Shri. Akash S. Agrawal appeared for hearing on 24.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in shape. Final Plot No. 457, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
546	Sachin Omprakash Agrawal	Moho	113/7/1	Class I	551	1600	458	640	640	Shri. Akash S. Agrawal appeared for hearing on 24.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in shape & change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 458, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
547	Dilip Raghunath Bhoir	Moho	36/4	Class I	209	1200	459	480	480	They have not appeared for a hearing and submitted representation dated 31.07.23. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	They have been granted final plot in part of their original holding bearing Gut no. 36/4 and adjoining lands. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 461, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
548	Purushottam Vishnu Behare	Moho	37/4/B	Class I	217	600	460	240	240	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract ownership is changed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 460, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
549	Raibai Ragho Kadav, Hiraman Ragho Kadav, Prakash Ragho Kadav, Gulabbai Ananta Rodpalkar, Yamunabai Ashok Gaykar, Krushnabai Ragho Kadav, Janabai Ragho Kadav	Moho	68/1/B	Class I	386	570	461	228	228	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	A.) In the sanctioned Draft TPS - 6, 1.) Final Plot no. 120 was proposed for Gut no. 1/2, 65/3, 68/1/A, 116/6/B, 121/3, 123/6, Moho. 2.) Final Plot no. 172 & 263 were proposed for Gut no. 5/4, 58/5, Moho. 3.) Final Plot no. 179 was proposed for Gut no. 126/1, Moho. 4.) Final Plot no. 461 was proposed for Gut no. 68/1/B, Moho. B.) As per registered distribution deed 1442/2020 dated 03.02.2020, mutation entry no. 2473 was registered. Thereafter, according to updated 7/12 extract the name of the owners of above Gut no. are changed. C.) The owners have submitted notarised stamped consent letter dated




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											20.10.20223 and accordingly requested to grant separate final plot as per their holdings. D.) According to their consent letter and updated 7/12 extract, the layout of the scheme has been revised and revised reconstituted final plots are allotted as follows; i.) For Gut no. 5/4, 116/6/B, 68/1/B, 65/3, 58/5, Moho Village total area 4900 sq. m. of Hiranman Ragho Kadav & Prakash Ragho Kadav, Final Plot no. 341 A has been allotted on their existing structure in Gut no. 58. ii.) For Gut no. 123/6, 1/2, 5/4, 68/1/A, Moho Village total area 4730 sq. mt. of Suresh Rambhau Kadav & Yashwant Rambhau Kadav, Final Plot no. 310 has been allotted. iii.) For Gut no. 5/4, 58/5, 126/1, Moho Village total area 4100 sq. m. of Nama Padu Kadav, Final Plot no. 263 has been allotted. iv.) For Gut no. 123/6 & 121/3 total area 4700 sq. m. of Nirabai Anant Kadav, Sarita Balkrishna Patil and Surekha Sunil Mhatre Final Plot no. 118 has been allotted. The area is recorded in Table B.
550	Harishchandra Zipa Patil, Padmakar Zipa Patil	Shivkar	75/2/1	Class I	100	1690	463	676	676	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 521, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
551	Sagar Sachin Agarwal	Moho	31/1/C	Class II	182	4400	464	1760	5760	Shri.Akash S. Agrawal, authorized by Shri. Sagar S Agrawal appeared for a hearing on 24.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed.
552		Moho	113/7/2	Class I	552	2200		880			
553		Moho	114/2	Class I	556	2900		1160			
554		Moho	114/3	Class I	557	4900		1960			




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) In Final Plot 464, there is an existing flow of water, therefore requested to realign the watercourse and allot the final plot.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 464, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
555	Shankar Ganya Bhoir, Maruti Ganya Bhoir	Moho	38/1	Class II	219	4200	465	1680	1680	They have not appeared for hearing and Shri. Shankar Gana Bhoir and Shri. Maruti Gana Bhoir submitted their representation dated 26.06.23. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 465 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 38/1 and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 465, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
556	Ganpat Maya Topale, Nagibai Maya Topale, Shankar Bandu Topale, Shantabai Changa Topale, Gurunath Changa Topale, Yogesh Changa Topale, Sangita Sanjay Patil, Yamuna Sudam Bhopi, Indu Bandu Topale, Jomi Pandhari Shelake, Surekha Santosh Fadke, Rekha Santosh Fadke, Jayashri Santosh Fadke, Amruta Santosh Fadke	Shivkar	77	Class II	103	4580	466	1832	1832	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 466, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
557	Mahesh Ramesh Patil, Jitesh Ramesh Patil, Tejas Ramesh Patil	Shivkar	91/1	Class I	115	1790	468	716	716	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 468, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
558	Mahesh Ramesh Patil	Shivkar	91/2	Class I	116	1700	469	680	680	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 469, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
559	Sandip Aanandrao Pawar, Rajendra Vitthalrao Kolkar, Satish Baban Vidhate, Subhash Aanadrao Borate.	Moho	39/3	Class I	229	1800	470	720	720	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 470, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
560	Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal	Moho	39/2	Class I	228	500	471	200	440	Shri. Shekhar Namdev Bhujbal appeared for a hearing on 22.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, they requested to allot them a combined final plot on a 20M wide road, by amalgamating the final plot no. 471, 453, and 353 which are in the ownership of Smt. Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal and Ms. Sadhika Shekhar Bhujbal, Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, new regulation has been proposed. As per their request final plots no. 353,453, 471 in the sanctioned draft scheme are amalgamated and combined final plot no. 353 has been granted. Final Plot no. 353A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
561		Moho	48/4		280	600		240			
562	Shami Mangalya Patil	Shivkar	317	Class II	122	3060	473	1224	1224	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 473, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
563	Sangita Laxman Pavanekar, Tukaram Dattatreya Patil, Surdas Dattatreya Patil, Shantaram Dattatreya Patil, Shantabai Dattatreya Patil, Fashibai Dattatreya Patil, Surekha Haribhau Kurangale, Leelabai Dattatreya Patil, Sugandha Pandurang Patil, Pandharinath Dattatreya Patil	Moho	2/4	Class I	134	3310	476	1324	9208	They have not appeared for a hearing and submitted representation on 08.09.23. Submission in representation: 1.) For their survey no. 2/4, 4/4, 40/6, 41/1/A, 41/1/B, 117/4, 133/2, Final Plot no. 476 is granted in survey no. 40/6. They requested to do reallocation as follows: a.) Final plots for Survey No. 2/4 and 4/4 shall be granted in respective survey no. only. b.) Final plot no. 476 shall be granted for survey no. 40/6, 41/1/A, 41/1/B, 117/4, and 133/2.	As per their request, for their Gut no. 133/2 the separate Final plot 209 has been allotted in part of their original Gut no. 2/4. For their remaining land Gut no. 2/4, 4/4, 40/6, 41/1/A, 41/1/B, 117/4 a revised reconstituted Final Plot No. 476, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
564		Moho	4/4	Class I	147	2600		1040			
565		Moho	40/6	Class II	240	4200		1680			
566		Moho	41/1/A	Class II	241	3450		1380			
567		Moho	41/1/B	Class II	242	1650		660			
568		Moho	117/4	Class II	583	5100		2040			
569		Moho	133/2	Class I	671	2710		1084			
570	Balaram Namdev Patil	Moho	40/3	Class II	237	1500	477	600	600	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											ownership. Final Plot No. 477, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
571	Baburao Shankar Mhatre	Moho	40/2	Class II	236	2400	478	960	960	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 478, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
572	Baburao Shankar Mhatre, Sakharam Shankar Mhatre.	Moho	40/1	Class I	235	1600	479	640	640	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 479, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
573	Jectendra Yugraj Jain, Mahavir Basantilal Surana, Rakesh Sohanlal Chaplot	Moho	45/1	Class I	257	1600	480	640	640	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 480, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
574	Tukaram Damu Shelke	Moho	136/2A	Class I	677	2000	482	800	800	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 482, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
575	Kishor Maruti Pathe, Dwarkabai Tukaram Patil, Narendra Maruti Pathe, Rupesh Maruti Pathe, Suvama Maruti Pathe, Dharmendra Walji Kariya	Moho	136/3	Class I	679	5200	483	2080	2080	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 483, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
576	Bhumiraj Choice Realtors Limited	Moho	141/B (P)	Class I	686	195123.2 *	484, 485, 494, 562	78049.28	78049.28	Shri. Deepak V. Karia appeared for a hearing on behalf of Bhumiraj Choice Realtors Limited on 30.05.23, Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. Final Plot 484 is of irregular shape and therefore requested to allot a rectangular Final Plot. They have been granted four Final Plots at different locations and therefore requested that at least 2 plots be adjoining to each other and front on 60M wide Spine Road. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due	As per joint measurment statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 141 (Part) of Bhumiraj Choice Realtors – 9149 sq. mt. of area out of 201900 sq. mt was acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 1,92,751 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of 77,100. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 484, 485, 494, 562 as shown in plan no. 4, has been allotted to the




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
577	Rajesh Sohanmal Mehta, Ajay Sohanmal Mehta, Sanjay Sohanmal Mehta, Prasad Lakshman Gaikwad, Vedant Prasad Gaikwad	Chikhale	140/4	Class I	37	13300	486	5320	5320	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 486, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
578	Vinay Vijay Agrawal, Vijay Narottamdas Agrawal, Surdas Dattatreya Agrawal.	Moho	30	Class I	178	5560	489	2224	2224	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 489, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
579	Gana Ganpat Tupe, Gunabai Ganu Dhavale, Baraki Tukaram Dhavale, Kashi Ganpat Tupe, Rama Bendu Tupe.	Shivkar	40/0	Class I	56	2760	490	1104	1104	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot No. 490, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
580	Dattatray M. Karpe, Sunil Kondaji Kokre, Sunil Shrikrishna Bhalerao, Sanjay Kumar Chaturvedi	Pali Khurd	21/2/1(P)	Class I	709	2075*	491	830.18	830.18	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per joint measurment statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 21/2 - 16450 sq. mt. the area of 13976 sq. mt. was acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 2474 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of 990 sq. mt. Final Plot No. 491, has been allotted, subject to change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
581	Deepak Govind Shelke, Ramchandra Govind Shelke, Santosh Govind Shelke, Varsha Anant Shelke, Jayshree Dattatreya Shelke	Pali Khurd	21/2/2(P)	Class I	710						
582	Ramdas Lakshman Shelke	Pali Khurd	21/2/3(P)	Class II	711						
583	Niraj Santosh Singhania, Manoj Pashupatinath Dokania, Manish Pashupatinath Dokania, Ashish Pashupatinath Dokania, Mukesh Pashupatinath Dokania	Pali Khurd	21/2/4(P)	Class I	712						




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
584	Santosh Jethya Patil, Kalpana Baliram Gadkari, Nandkumar Jethya Patil	Chikhale	136/1B	Class I	14	1850	492	740	740	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot No. 492, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
585	Rajendra Ramchandra Chandne	Chikhale	131/2(P)	Class I	8	1780	493	712	712	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 493, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
586	Shree. Ganpati Dev Vahivatdar, Chander Dhau Patil, Anant Dhondu Dhavale, Gopal Hiru Patil, Lakshman Mangalya Kamble, Tukaram Ragho Tople, Dharma Kathor Tupe, Anesh Ganu Dhavale, Ananta Rama Patil, Prakash Padu Popeta	Shivkar	69	Class I	93	25320	495	10128	10128	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 495, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
587	Pandharinath Dattatreya Patil	Moho	140/0	Class I	685	2500	496	1000	1000	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 496, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
588	Manik L. Shah	Moho	29/1	Class I	174	1300	497	520	520	Shri. Satish More appeared for a hearing on behalf of Smt. Sampada Satish More, Smt. Hemlata Vishal Dhage and Shri. Amol Kalidas Deshmukh on 26.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. Further requested that TDR so generated shall be bought by NAINA Authority and give valid compensation in lieu of the same. 3.) The ownership details in form -1, are incorrect and need an updation, the survey no. 29/1 was purchased from Shri. Manik Shah by Smt. Sampada Satish More,	Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 497, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										Smt. Hemlata Vishal Dhage and Shri. Amol Kalidas Deshmukh through a registered sale deed dated 03.10.2019. 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	
589	Khandu Balu Fadke, Lilabai Sadanand Mhatre, Manibai Namdev Patil.	Moho	29/2	Class II	175	14000	498	5600	5600	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 498, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
590	Lahu Hiru Bhoir, Vasant Hiru Bhoir, Budhaji Hiru Bhoir, Dhunkuribai Sudam Shelke, Yamunabai Balkrishna Wagmare.	Moho	29/3A	Class II	176	1700	499	680	680	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Subject to change in ownership. Final Plot No. 499, as shown in plan no 4 has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
591	Yatin Bhagwan Patil	Moho	28/2/C	Class I	173	1800	500	720	720	Shri. Yatin Bhagwan Patil appeared for a hearing on 23.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 500, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
592	Maruti Dhondur Shelake, Sandip Urf Pradip Ganpat Shelake	Moho	28/2/B	Class II	172	2500	501	1000	1000	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 501, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
593	Kishan Ganya Bhoir, Banobai Pandharinath Shendre,	Moho	31/1/A	Class II	179	4100	503	1640	1640	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. subject to change in ownership. Final Plot No. 503, as shown in plan no




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Kalibai Shantaram Phadke, Dattatreya Ganya Bhoir.										4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
594	Muktabai Balaram Bhoir, Trimbak Balaram Bhoir, Raghunath Balaram Bhoir, Arun Balaram Bhoir, Gurunath Balaram Bhoir, Suman Baburao Patil, Madhuri Trimbak Gharat.	Moho	31/1/B/2	Class II	181	2000	504	800	800	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract ownership is changed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 508, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
595	Amol Subhash Shinde	Moho	32/2	Class I	185	600	506	240	240	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 510, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
596	Rajubai Mahadu Bhoir, Narendra Mahadu Bhoir, Anjana Mahadu Bhoir.	Moho	27/1/B (P)	Class II	163	198.14*	509	79.256	544.696	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per joint measurment statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 27/1/B - 3600 sq. mt. the area of 3577 sq. mt. was acquired and out of Gut no. 27/1/D - 1700 sq. mt. the area of 1023 sq. mt. has been acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 700 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of 280 sq. mt. Final Plot No. 509, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
597		Moho	27/1/D (P)		164	1163.65*		465.440			
598	Yamunabai Aalya Mhaskar, Baban Aalya Mhaskar, Ramchandra Aalya Mhaskar, Waman Aalya Mhaskar, KrushnaBai Ram Mali.	Moho	27/3(P)	Class II	167	2563.59*	510	1025.437	1025.437	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per joint measurment statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 27/3 - 6500 sq. mt. the area of 3474 sq. mt. was acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 3026 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of 1210 sq. mt. Final Plot No. 507, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
599	Lahu Hiru Bhoir, Vasant Hiru Bhoir, Budhaji Hiru Bhoir, Dunkaribai Sudam Shelke, Yamunabai Balkrishna Wagmare,	Moho	37/1	Class II	213	6100	511	2440	2440	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot No. 506, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Sudhakar Govind Bhoir, Manoj Ganpat Dauer, Panklesh Bamji Dauer, Vikas Prakash Chavan, Maruti Haraji Raut										
600	Baban Dinkar Bhoir, Ramdas Dinkar Bhoir, Ganesh Dinkar Bhoir, Shantaram Dinkar Bhoir, Kisan Dinkar Bhoir, Bebi Krishna Patil, Soni Dinkar Bhoir, Mai Dinkar Bhoir.	Moho	31/1/B/1	Class II	180	9500	512	3800	3800	They have not appeared for hearing and Shri. Baban Dinkar Bhoir, Shri. Ramdas Dinkar Bhoir, Shri. Ganesh Dinkar Bhoir, Shri. Shantaram Dinkar Bhoir, Shri. Kisan Dinkar Bhoir submitted representation dated 26.06.23. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 512 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 31/1/B and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in Final Plot Number. Final Plot no. 505, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
601	Balaram Ganu Patil	Chikhale	131/1	Class II	7	2700	513	1080	1080	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract ownership is changed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. subject to change in Final Plot No. 504, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
602	Bhimabai Dhulya Bhoir, Baliram Dhulya Bhoir, Anantha Dhulya Bhoir, Bayobai Dattu Bhopi, Vanita Dhulya Bhoir.	Moho	27/1/A (P)	Class II	162	1369.204 *	515	547.682	547.682	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per joint measurment statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 27/1/A - 3350sq. mt. the area of 2468 sq. mt. was acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 883 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of 353 sq. mt. Final Plot No. 518, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
603	Rahul Laxman Kamble, Rupesh Namdev Kamble, Shirish Vijay Kamble, Rakesh Namdeo Kamble, Ratesh Lakshman Kamble, Girish Vijay Kamble	Shivkar	66/1	Class I	89	5360	516	2144	2144	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Subject to change in Final Plot Number. Final Plot No. 512, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
604	Ganesh Ladku Bhoir, Dasharath Ladku Bhoir, Devaki Ladku Bhoir,	Moho	33/1/B	Class II	192	5100	517	2040	2040	They have not appeared for hearing and Shri. Ganesh Ladku Bhoir, Shri. Dasharath Ladku Bhoir, Shri. Pandurang Ladku Bhoir, Shri. Balaram Laduk Bhoir, Smt. Mangala Vishnu	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 517 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 33/1 and adjoining lands.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Pandurang Ladku Bhoir, Baram Laduk Bhoir									Patil, Smt. Hirabai Sudam Patil, Smt. Shevanti Pandurang Mhatre submitted representation dated 26.06.23, Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Subject to change in Final Plot Number. Final Plot no. 513, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
605	Santosh Sankar Ghodinde, Rashmi Ravindra Jhemse, Rajshri Rajendra Chandne, Manisha Umesh Tupe	Moho	32/3	Class II	188	2500	518	1000	4344	Shri. Santosh Shankar Ghodinde appeared for a hearing on 23.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The ownership details as per form -1 are correct, however need spelling correction as follows: i.) Santosh Shankar Ghodinde, ii.) Rashmi Ravindra Zemse, iii.) Rajashri Rajendra Chandane, iv.) Manisha Umesh Tupe 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to correction in the name of the owners, as per their request, subject to change in Final Plot Number. Final Plot No. 514, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
606		Moho	33/1/A		191	4300		1720			
607		Moho	36/5/A		210	1640		656			
608		Moho	38/3/B		222	300		120			
609		Moho	73/2/A		419	2120		848			
610	Rushish Mansukh Timbadia, Amol Namdev Bhagat	Moho	33/2/A/1	Class I	193	3000	519	1200	1920	Shri. Rushish Mansukh Timbadia appeared for a hearing on 22.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. They claimed that the location of their final plot was changed and therefore requested to allot the Final Plot as per the earlier location having the frontage of 60 mt. road and anchored to their survey number. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final
611		Moho	33/2/A/2/2		194B	1800		720			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Plot no. 515A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
612	Parashuram Balya Dhavale, Goma Balya Dhavale, Suman Baban Patil, Bhagubai Goma Patil	Shivkar	79/1	Class I	107	7340	519B	2936	2936	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in Final Plot Number. Final Plot No. 515B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
613	Lahu Hiru Bhoir, Vasant Hiru Bhoir, Budhaji Hiru Bhoir, Dunkaribai Sudam Shelke, Yamunabai Balkrishna Waghmare, Sudhakar Govind Bhoir.	Moho	32/1	Class II	184	600	520	240	2360	Shri. Lahu Hiru Bhoir, Shri. Vasant Hiru Bhoir, Shri. Budhaji Hiru Bhoir, Shri. Sudhakar Govind Bhoir appeared for a hearing on 29.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) The ownership details as per form -1 are incorrect, survey no. 37/3 of Village Moho has been shown in combined ownership of Lahu Hiru Bhoir, Vasant Hiru Bhoir, Budhaji Hiru Bhoir, Dunkaribai Sudam Shelke, Yamunabai Balkrishna Waghmare, Sudhakar Govind Bhoir, However, as per the City Civil Court order dated 02.11.2019 in suit no 310/2019, survey no. 37/3- area 1600 sq. m has been totally granted to Shri. Sudhakar Hiru Bhoir, Accordingly they requested to grant a separate final plot for 37/3.	As per updated 7/12 extract the ownership of all the lands has been changed. Accordingly, Proposed Final plot no. 520 in sanctioned draft scheme is subdivided and separate final plot has been allotted as follows: 1.) For Gut no. 32/1 - Final Plot 519B 2.) For Gut no. 37/2 - Final Plot 519A 3.) For Gut no. 37/3 - Final Plot 517 4.) For Gut no. 60/8 - Final Plot 519C Final Plot No. 520C, 520D, 520E, 520F as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
614		Moho	37/2		214	800		320			
615		Moho	37/3		215	3700		1480			
616		Moho	60/8		349	800		320			
617	Tushar Damji Nisar	Chikhale	140/3A	Class I	36A	3300	520A	1320	1320	Shri. Tushar Damji Nisar appeared for a hearing on 29.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in Final Plot Number. Final Plot No. 516A, as shown in plan



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
618	Lahu Hiru Bhoir	Moho	33/2/A/2/1	Class II	194A	3000	520B	1200	1200	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in Final Plot Number. Final Plot No. 516B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
619	Dattu Dhau Bhoir	Moho	33/3	Class II	196	2900	521	1160	1760	Shri. Sanjay Naga Bhoir appeared for a hearing on 04.08.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The ownership details as per Form - 1 are incorrect and need an updation. Shri. Dattu Bhoir has granted his rights in survey no. 33/3 to Shri. Jaydas Naga Bhoir and Shri. Sanjay Naga Bhoir and rights in survey no. 36/2 was granted to Shri. Naga Dattu Bhoir, the mutation entry no. 2641 states the same. Thus requested to do a needful change in ownership of Final Plot No. 373. 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. As per updated 7/12 extract the ownership of all the lands has been changed. Accordingly, Proposed Final plot no. 521 in sanctioned draft scheme is subdivided and separate final plot has been allotted as follows; 1.) For Gut no. 33/3 - Final Plot 520A 2.) For Gut no. 36/2 - Final Plot 520B
620		Moho	36/2		207	1500		600			Final Plot No. 520A & 520B, as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
621	Jaydas Naga Bhoir, Sanjay Naga Bhoir	Moho	36/3	Class I	208	1000	522	400	400	Shri. Sanjay Naga Bhoir appeared for a hearing on 29.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The ownership details as per Form -	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										I are incorrect and need an updation. Survey no. 36/3 of village Moho of area 1000 sq. m, was purchased by Shri. Rajesh Ashok Patil and Shri. Ashish Baliram Sapale through a registered sale deed no. 8658/2021 dt. 18/08/2021, thus request to update the same in the ownership of Final Plot no. 522. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 522, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
622	Sarika Atul Bhagat	Moho	36/1	Class I	206	700	523	280	280	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 523, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
623	Sitaram Haiya Shinde, Sakharam Balu Shinde, Tukaram Ladku Shinde, Bhavika Machindra Thombre, Guardian Mother Archana Thombre, Archana Machindra Thombre, Darshana Machhindra Thombre, Sujita Subhash Patil, Harshada Machindra Thombre, Mathura Sudam Aagivale, Surekha Suresh Thakur, Yamuna Shantaram Badekar, Shobha Damodar Bhalekar, Gulab Arun Bolade.	Moho	36/6	Class II	212	2900	524	1160	2920	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 524, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
624		Moho	39/1		227	2600		1040			
625		Moho	40/4		238	1800		720			
626	Ganpat Hasuram Bhomkar	Moho	37/5	Class I	218	2400	525	960	1680	Shri. Nitin Maruti Pawar appeared for a hearing on 16.06.23, Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The ownership details as per form -	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is.
627		Moho	137/1		680	1800		720			

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										I, are incorrect and need an updation. The survey no. 37/5, of village Moho was purchased by i.) Nitin Maruti Pawar, ii.) Aruna Nanasaheb Jagtap, iii.) Balaji Mahadev Thakur, iv.) Sangita Madhukar Nirphal, v.) Ashok Yamnappa Ellager, vi.) Ajit Shivaji Bhujbal, vii.) Laxman Angadrao Darade from Shri. Ganpat Bhomkar, wide registered sale deed. Furthermore, the survey no. 137/1 of village Moho was purchased by i.) Nitin Maruti Pawar, ii.) Ashok Yamnappa Ellager, iii.) Devanand Gopalrao Vir, iv.) Vikram Shrimant Nikam, v.) Ajit Ashokrao Mhetre, vi.) Vishwajit Vithhalrao Shinde, vii.) Gayatri Rajendra Kakade, viii.) Ujjawal Shivaji Desai from Ganpat Hasuram Bhomkar wide registered sale deed. The mutation entry no. 2581 and 2596 justify the change in ownership, thus requesting to allot combined final plot no. 525 in the name of Nitin Maruti Pawar and 12 others. 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	confirmed, subject to change in the name of owners, as per their request and updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 525, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
628	Kashinath Pandurang Shinde, Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal	Moho	68/4	Class I	389	5300	526	2120	2120	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 526, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
629	Baban Maruti Dhawale, Bhagwan Maruti Dhawale, Janabai Baban Patil, Radha Maruti Dhawale, Shashikala Pai.	Shivkar	74	Class I	98	6020	527	2408	2408	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in location. Final Plot No. 528, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
630	Nirmala Maruti Bhagat	Shivkar	79/3(P)	Class II	109	5740	528	2296	2296	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in location. Final Plot No. 529, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
631		Moho	32/4	Class I	189	1000	529	400	2080	Shri. Manoj Krushnaji Bhujbal appeared for a hearing on 23.06.23,	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant
632		Moho	33/2/B		195	2400		960			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
633	Manoj Krushnaji Bhujbal, Hemant Krushnaji Bhujbal, Ashok Krushnaji Bhujbal.	Moho	40/5		239	1800		720		submission in hearing: 1.) The Final Plot 526 is in the ownership of their Sister-in-law Mrs. Sandhya Shekhar Bhujbal and others and therefore requested to allot them Final Plot adjoining to FP No.526 and front on 20M wide road. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) As per mutation entry no. 2508, after the demise of their co-owner, Late. Ashok Krushnaji Bhujbal, the names of his heirs Smt. Sunanda Ashok Bhujbal, Shri. Prashant Ashok Bhujbal and Sau. Pradnya Shivraj Boravake appeared in the 7/12 extract and thus requested to update the ownership details of the Final Plot. 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	the final plot of a minimum of 50% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in location, change in the name of owners as per the updated 7/12 extract and change in final plot no. as 527. Final Plot No. 527, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
634	Pramod Hasuram Mhatre	Moho	27/2(P)	Class II	166	2068.93*	530	827.573	827.573	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per joint measurment statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 27/2 - 2100sq. mt. the area of 480 sq. mt. was acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 1620 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of 648 sq. mt. Final Plot No. 530, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
635	Shekhar Shamakant Naik	Moho	34/1/B	Class I	198	2180	531	872	872	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 531, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
636	Bhikya Dhau Bhoir	Moho	34/2	Class I	199	5700	532	2280	2280	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per joint measurment statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 34/2 - 5700sq. mt. the area of 255 sq. mt. was



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
											acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 5445 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of 2178 sq. mt. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 532A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
637	Ekanath Vitthal Kadav	Moho	121/2	Class I	595	4000	532C	1600	1600	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 534A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
638	Anna Shankar Bhoir, Rama Shankar Bhoir, Subhash Shankar Bhoir, Raghunath Shankar Bhoir.	Moho	34/4	Class II	201	3700	533	1480	4520	They have not appeared for hearing and Shri. Ramchandra Shankar Bhoir, Shri. Anna Shankar Bhoir, Shri. Raghunath Shankar Bhoir, Shri. Subhash Shankar Bhoir submitted representation dated 31.07.23. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 533 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 34/4 and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in final plot no. as 533C. Final Plot no. 533C, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
639		Moho	37/4/A		216	2200		880			
640		Moho	38/3/A		221	1200		480			
641		Moho	66/1/A		374	2000		800			
642		Moho	75/5/2'		436	2200		880			
643	Muktabai Balam Bhoir, Trimbak Balam Bhoir, Raghunath Balam Bhoir, Arun Balam Bhoir, Gurunath Balam Bhoir, Suman Baburao Patil, Madhuri Trambak Gharat.	Moho	28/1/A(P)	Class II	168	1887.34*	533A	754.92	1438.92	Shri. Nilesh Trimbak Bhoir appeared for a hearing on 23.06.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They requested to allot them the Final Plot at the junction of two roads. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. The FSI of 3.00 shall be availed for utilization on the final plot. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The ownership details as per form -1 are incorrect and need an updation, as per mutation entry no. 2400 and 2495, the ownership details are as follows: i.) Manik Trimbak Bhoir, ii.) Vilas Trimbak Bhoir, iii.) Jagdish Trimbak	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. As per joint measurement statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 28/1/A - 3710sq. mt. the area of 2157sq. mt. was acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 1553 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of
644		Moho	28/1/C		170	1710		684			



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										<p>Bhoir, iv.) Nilesh Trimbak Bhoir, v.) Nisha Nandkumar Patil. 4.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged. 5.) They requested compensation for their house and trees in the original holding. Also, requested for certificate of Project Affected People. Shri. Nilesh Trimbak Bhoir submitted a representation on 23.06.23. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.</p>	<p>621 sq. mt. As per updated 7/12 extract the ownership of both lands is changed and therefore separate final plot no. 533A has been granted to Gut no. 28/1/C & 533B has been granted to Gut no. 28/1/A. Final Plots no. 533A & 533B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
645	Ganu Kamalu Mhatre, Shantibai Tunya Bhopi, Janabai Namdev Mhatre, Yashwant Namdev Mhatre, Aarti Namdev Patil, Malati Ganpat Patil, Subhadra Baliram Mhatre, Rajesh Baliram Mhatre, Santosh Baliram Mhatre, Smita Laxman Tandel.	Moho	35/1/4/1	Class II	203	2870	534	1148	1148	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in final plot no. as 534B. Final Plot No. 534B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
646	Khushalchand Fakirchand Lunkad, Suhas Khushalchand Lunkad, Sanjay Khushalchand Lunkad, Milind Khushalchand Lunkad, Bharat Suvalal Desadala, Deepak Kacherdas Bhatevara	Shivkar	297	Class I	119	2860	535	1144	1144	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 535, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
647	Lakshman Dharma Chaudhary, Janardan Dharma Chaudhary	Chikhale	140/1	Class II	34	3200	536	1280	1280	<p>Shri. Rajanath Janardan Choudhary and Shri. Nilesh Laxman Chaudhari appeared for a hearing on 13.07.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the allotted final plot in the</p>	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 536, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										sanctioned draft TPS. 2.) They do not accept the NAINA Town Planning Scheme.	
648	Sandip Janardan Ghogare, Vaibhav Sandip Ghogare	Shivkar	75/2/2	Class I	101	2000	537	800	800	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 537, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
649	Namdev Mahadu Phadke, Shantibai Govind Jambhulkar, Baby Mahadu Phadke, Tukaram Mahadu Phadke, Rasika Ramdas Phadke, Suman Ramdas Phadke, Yogesh Ramdas Phadke, Manisha Manohar Malusare, Santosh Ananta Kathare, Sanjay Ananta Kathare, Vandana Ananta Kathare	Shivkar	320/1	Class I	127	8240	539	3296	3296	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot No. 539, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
650	Gana Maruti Chaudhury	Chikhale	139/4	Class I	31	2000	540	800	2360	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 540, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
651		Chikhale	140/2		35	3900		1560			
652	Baban Dinkar Bhoir, Ramdas Dinkar Bhoir, Ganesh Dinkar Bhoir, Shantaram Dinkar Bhoir, Kisan Dinkar Bhoir, Bebi Krishna Patil, Soni Dinkar Bhoir, Mai Dinkar Bhoir.	Moho	28/1/B	Class II	169	5280	541	2112	3512	They have not appeared for hearing and Shri. Baban Dinkar Bhoir, Shri. Ramdas Dinkar Bhoir, Shri. Ganesh Dinkar Bhoir, Shri. Shantaram Dinkar Bhoir, Shri. Kisan Dinkar Bhoir submitted representation dated on 26.06.23. Submission in representation: 1.) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection to include them in the said scheme.	In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 541 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 71/6 and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot no. 541, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
653		Moho	71/6		411	3500		1400			
654	M/s Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd, Shivom Developers LLP	Moho	70/4	Class I	403	3300	542	1320	1320	Shri. Vishal Kulkarni appeared for a hearing on behalf of M/s. Valuable Property Pvt. Ltd. on 29.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and requested to allot a separate final plot for their holding in survey no. 70/4. Also requested to grant the final plot	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										of a minimum of 50% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 3.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in Final Plot no. as 542A, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
655	Budhaji Sawlaya Shelke, Lahu Sawlya Shelke, Ankush Sawlya Shelke, Bami Janu Patil, Sunil Vasant Shelke, Sunita Vasant Shelke, Shivom Developers LLP.	Pali Khurd	18/3/1	Class I	693	5840	543	2336	2336	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 543, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
656	Jairam Nathu Shelke, Ramkrishna Nathu Shelke, Yamunabai Sadashiv Khutle, Krishnabai Dattu Patil, Shubhangi Harishchandra Phadke, Vaibhav Nathuram Patil, Sushma Nathuram Patil, Bharti Bharat Mhatre, Ganesh Sitaram Shelke, Nanda Arun Mhaskar, Radhabai Chandrakant Bhopi, Manohar Vitthal Patil, Sangeeta Kaluram Barve, Ram Vitthal Patil, Jagdish Vitthal Patil, Kalpesh Bhaskar Kondilkar, Krushesh Bhaskar Kondilkar, Shevanta Motiram Bhoir	Pali Khurd	1/2/1(P)	Class II	687	737.983*	544	295.19	295.19	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 544, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
657	M/s Valuable Properties Pvt. Ltd.	Pali Khurd	1/2/2(P)	Class I	688						
658	M/s Valuable Properties Pvt. Ltd.	Pali Khurd	1/2/3(P)	Class I	689						
659	Raghunath Kana Shelke	Pali Khurd	1/2/4(P)	Class I	690						



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
660	Dhau Ambo Mhaskar, Mahadu Ambo Mhaskar, Changa Ambo Mhaskar, Hira Ambo Mhaskar, Gana Ambo Mhaskar, Guna Ambo Mhaskar, Nami Ambo Mhaskar, Chandrabhaga Kundalik Mhaskar, Rajendra Kundalik Mhaskar, Ram Kundalik Mhaskar, Sachin Kundalik Mhaskar, Nitin Kundalik Mhaskar,	Moho	71/4	Class II	409	1300	545	520	520	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 545, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
661	Shivom Developers LLP	Moho	35/1/3/4/3	Class I	202	8030	547, 425	3212	25936	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this Final Plot no. 425 & 547 as per sanctioned draft scheme have been combined and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 547, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
662		Moho	35/1/4/2		204	900		360			
663		Moho	35/2		205	1700		680			
664		Moho	64/2		357	1600		640			
665		Moho	64/3		358	800		320			
666		Moho	65/1		363	3000		1200			
667		Moho	65/4		366	400		160			
668		Moho	65/5		367	400		160			
669		Moho	65/8A		370	250		100			
670		Moho	66/1/B		375	450		180			
671		Moho	66/2		377	700		280			
672		Moho	66/3		378	2000		800			
673		Moho	69/3		393	4100		1640			
674		Moho	69/5		395	3400		1360			
675		Moho	70/1		400	3300		1320			
676		Moho	70/6		405	2100		840			
677		Moho	71/2		407	1800		720			
678		Moho	73/1		418	4000		1600			
679		Moho	73/2/B		420	3540		1416			
680		Moho	74/5		429	1400		560			
681		Pali Khurd	18/1		691	7120		2848			
682		Pali Khurd	18/2		692	2700		1080			
683		Pali Khurd	18/3/2		694	1740		696			
684		Pali Khurd	18/4		695	7890		3156			
685		Pali Khurd	20/0		707	1520		608			




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
686	M/s Dream Palms Co. Op. Hou. Soc. Ltd Tarfe Krushnakumar Ram Damde	Pali Khurd	19/1(P)	Class I	696	962.215*	548	384.886	384.886	Shri. Ravi Pratap Singh - Chairman and Shri. Vidya Sagar Sehgal - Vice-chairman appeared for a hearing on behalf of M/s Dream Palm Co. Op. Housing Society Tarfe Krushnakumar Ram Damde on 30.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. They requested to finalize the land to be acquired under the Proposed Multimodal Corridor and allot the final plot accordingly. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 5.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. As per joint measurment statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 19/1-1590 sq. mt. the area of 637 sq. mt. was acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 953 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of 381 sq. mt. As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 19/4/2 has been bifurcated into Gut no. 19/4/A & 19/4/B. Gut no. 19/4/A is now owned by M/s Dream Palms Society and therefore it is amalgamated with their Gut no. 19/1(P) (Final Plot no. 548 in draft scheme) and Final Plot no. 551A has been allotted to them. Final Plot No. 551A as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
687	Adhiraj Sharad Kadu, Anuj Bhaskarrao Hivre, Abhay Yashvant Yerekar, Asha Nimba Salunkhe, Dr. Chetankumar Dhanaji Khillare, Nikhil Nandkumar Khedekar, Nimba Bajrao Salunkhe, Pooja Prakash Bhatkar, Prathamesh Sanjay Kachare, Prafull Gulab Devre, Prajakta Nimba Salunkhe, Mayuresh Ashok Saindane, M/s Design Era EPC Contractors Pvt. Ltd. tarfe Pritam Padmakar Chandke, Shimpli Sanjay	Pali Khurd	19/2	Class I	697	4590	549	1836	1836	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 549, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Mate, Sagar Gorakshnath Jagdale, Sudhakar Jagannath Gavande, Surabhi Santosh Ambekar, Suruchi Vilas Gaikwad, Swapnil Shamrao Gadkar, Harshvardhan Purushottam Dhote, Ajit Yashvant Yerekar										
688	Chandrakant Ladku Patil, Sarika Vilas Thakur	Pali Khurd	19/3/1(P)		698						
689	Tukaram Vithal Shelke, Hanuman Vithal Shelke, Kisan Vithal Shelke, Arjun Vithal Shelke, Kundalik Vithal Shelke, Radhabai Vithal Shelke, Barkibai Vithal Shelke, Dwarkabai Vithal Shelke, Ladkibai Vithal Shelke, Rakhmibai Vithal Shelke, Bhagubai Baburao Patil	Pali Khurd	19/3/2(P)	Class II	699	7621.26*	550	3048.51	3048.51	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract the ownership of Gut no. 19/3/2 has been changed. Also as per the joint measurment statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug Multi Modal Corridor, the said gut no. 19/3/1 and 19/3/2 are not acquired by said multi modal corridor. Accordingly, Final Plot no. 550A has been granted for gut no. 19/3/2 and Final Plot no. 550B has been granted for gut no. 19/3/1. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and revised reconstituted Final Plot no.550A , 550B as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
690	Madhukar Mahadu Dhavale, Dream Palms Co.op. Housing Soc., Panvel tarfe promoter Krishnakumar Ram Damde	Pali Khurd	19/4/2	Class I	701	5280	551	2112	2112	Shri. Ravi Pratap Singh - Chairman and Shri. Vidya Sagar Sehgal - Vice-chairman appeared for a hearing on behalf of M/s Dream Palm Co. Op. Housing Society Tarfe Krushnakumar Ram Damde on 30.05.23. Submission in hearing: 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. In survey no. 19/4/2 of village Pali Khurd, 3280 sq. m. area belongs to Shri. Madhukar Shelke and the rest 2000 sq. m. is in the ownership of Dream Palms Co.op. Housing Soc., Panvel tarfe promoter Krishnakumar Ram Damde. The procedure separation of the area is in progress, and therefore request to grant a separate final plot of good shape, adjacent to the final plot no. 548. Also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-6, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-6. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been proposed. As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 19/4/2 has been bifurcated into Gut no. 19/4/A & 19/4/B. Gut no. 19/4/A is now owned by M/s Dream Palms Society and therefore it is amalgamated with their Gut no. 19/1(P) (Final Plot no. 548 in draft scheme) and Final Plot no. 551A has been allotted to them. Now for the



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 3.) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4.) By considering the development of the High Rise Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Gut no. 19/4/B Final Plot no. 551B has been granted. Final Plot No. 551A, 551B as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
691	Anesh Ganu Dhavale	Pali Khurd	19/4/1	Class I	700	1080	552	432	432	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract Gut no. 19/4/1 has been changed to Gut no. 19/4/C. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to slight change in location & change in name as per updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 552, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.As
692	Tukaram Vithal Shelke, Hanuman Vithal Shelke, Kisan Vithal Shelke, Arjun Vithal Shelke, Kundalik Vithal Shelke, Radhabai Vithal Shelke, Barkibai Vithal Shelke, Dwarkabai Vithal Shelke, Ladkibai Vithal Shelke, Rakhmibai Vithal Shelke, Bhagubai Baburao Patil	Pali Khurd	19/5	Class II	702	1560	554	624	624	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 554, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
693	Taibai Balaram Patil	Pali Khurd	19/7	Class II	706	2830	555	1132	1132	They have neither appeared for hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract and joint measurment statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 19/7- 2830 sq. mt. the area of 1394 sq. mt. was acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 1436 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of 574 sq. mt. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 555, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
694	Chandrabhaga Janardan Chorghhe	Pali Khurd	19/6/1	Class II	703	2420	556	968	968	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract ownership is changed.



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
695	M/s. Wadhwa Construction And Infrastructure Ltd. Mumbai tarfe Manohar Chhabariya.	Moho	34/1/A	Class I	197	1720	557	688	7312	They have not appeared for a hearing and they submitted representation on 05.08.23. Submission in representation: 1.) The contribution amount of Rs. 3, 32, 29,000/- (Three crores thirty-two lakhs twenty-nine thousand) mentioned in the notice dated 29.05.2023 is not binding and will not be applicable to them. Therefore, requested to take back the said notice.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 556, as shown in plan no 4., has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B. In the sanctioned draft scheme, Final plot no 557 was proposed in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no. 19/6/2 and adjoining lands. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 557, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
696		Moho	34/3	Class II	200	3300		1320			
697		Moho	39/4	Class II	230	1500		600			
698		Moho	46/2	Class II	265	800		320			
699		Moho	48/2/A	Class II	277	1710		684			
700		Moho	121/5/A	Class I	598	2350		940			
701		Moho	132/2	Class I	665	2500		1000			
702		Pali Khurd	19/6/2/1	Class I	704	2200		880			
703		Pali Khurd	19/6/2/2	Class I	705	2200		880			
704	Shantaram Dattatreya Patil, Surdas Dattatreya Patil	Moho	138/2	Class I	682	10000	563	4000	4000	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot No. 563, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
705	Pandharinath Dattatreya Patil, Surdas Dattatray Patil	Moho	138/3	Class I	683	12000	564	4800	4800	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 564, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
706	Janabai Chander Patil, Ramdas Chander Patil, Jayendra Chander Patil, Laxman Chander Patil, Bharat Chander Patil, Mahendra Chander Patil, Padma Krishna Batale, Sharda Ganesh Mhatre	Chikhale	136/1A	Class I	13	1850	566A	740	740	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in shape and final plot number. Final Plot No. 566, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
707	Namdev Hasha Patil	Chikhale	131/4(P)	Class I	9	1680	566	672	672	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 567, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
708	Falguni Bhagwandas Patel	Shivkar	81(P)	Class I	112	2320*	568	928	928	Shri. Anoop Patel appeared for hearing on behalf of the owner by submitting the Power	In the other right column of the 7/12 extract of Gut no 138/1A, it was



Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										of Attorney dated 22.09.2020. They appeared for a hearing on 30.05.2023 and submitted their representation at the time of the hearing and thereafter additional representation on 19/6/2023. Submission 1) Rehab Housing Pvt. Ltd. Own Gut No. 139/2, 138/1A, 142/3, 142/4 in Chikhale and Falguni Patel, who is their family member, owns Gut No. 81/0 in Shivkar Village. Earlier, with the consent letter dated 09.11.2020, they had given consent to provide them with a single final plot in the scheme. However, the company has been allotted Final plots no. 8 & 94 and Falguni Patel has been allocated Final plot no. 568 at different locations, therefore they contended that it will lead to hardship in planning and its financial viability, 2.) Civil Suit No. 675/2011 has been disposed of and accordingly wide mutation no. 3598, the entry of "litigation under civil suit no. 675/2011" in the 7/12 extract of Gut No. 142/3 and 142/4 has been deleted. Also, all the lands are under occupancy class I 3.) Therefore they requested to grant one combined final plot in the joint name of the company and Falguni Patel.	mentioned as "kulkayada kalam 63a -1 chya tartudis adhin kharedi- vikris pratibandh". Therefore, as per their request, their original lands bearing Gut no. 142/3, 142/4, 139/2, and 81 pt are clubbed together and combined Final Plot no.91 has been granted. For Gut no. 138/1A, Final plot no.94 has been granted. Accordingly Final Plot Nos. 91 & 94, as shown in plan no 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
709	Balkrishna Rama Patil, Madhukar Rama Patil, Ananta Rama Patil, Babybai Tukaram Khutale, Baburao Laxman Patil, Eknath Laxman Patil, Yamunabai Dinkar Harad, Aanandibai Jayram Bhagat, Barkibai Gangaram Thamke, Jaya Laxman Patil, Tukaram Hari Patil, Sham Hari Patil	Moho	119/1	Class I	590	13600	569	5440	5440	They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in ownership. Final Plot No. 569, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
710	Rajesh Shankarlal Kakani	Moho	26	Class I	161	6100	577	2440	2440	Shri. Tukaram Dattatreya Patil submitted representation on 21.03.23. Submission in representation: 1.) The survey no. 26/0 of village Moho was purchased by Balu Goma Patil, grandfather of Shri. Tukaram Dattatreya Patil from	As per Section 71 of the MR & TP Act, if any decree is passed by a civil court in a disputed claim of the ownership at any time and even after a final scheme has been sanctioned by the State Govt., then such final scheme shall be deemed to

Sr. No.	Proposal of Sactioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 06									Representation of Owner on Sanctioned Draft TPS 06	Decision of Arbitrator
	Name of Owner	Village	Survey No.	Tenure of Land	OP No.	Area as per 7/12 Records	FP No.	FP Area	Amalgamated FP Area		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
										<p>Sitaram Kathod Phadke and Laxman Kathod Phadke through registered sale deed. The said land is in their possession. 2.) Due to technical issue their name stayed on the document further by taking this in consideration they further tried to sell the property to Rajesh Shankar Kakani. 3.) They have registered the case in Panvel Civil Court by no. स्पे. मु. नं ४९३/२०१५. 4.) Requested to give information about the land.</p>	<p>have been suitably corrected/varied because of such decree. Therefore, the ownership of the final plot is maintained as per 7/12 extract of the original lands. As per updated 7/12 extract and mutation entry no. 1901, the original land bearing 26, Moho village is owned by Rajesh Shankar Kakani. As per joint measurment statement of the acquisition of Virar -Alibaug multi modal corridor, out of Gut no. 26 of Moho Village - 39 sq. mt. area out of 6100 sq. mt. was acquired. Accordingly, the net area remain with the owner is 6061 sq. mt. and they are entitled for the final plot of 2424 sq. mt. Final Plot No. 577, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
711	Tukaram Dattatrey Patil	Moho	138/4	Class I	684	16500	579	6600	6600	<p>They have neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.</p>	<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 579, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>

29th December, 2023.

(Abhiraj Girkar)
Arbitrator
Town Planning Scheme NAINA No 6

(Nirmalkumar Chaudhari)
Deputy Secretary

Urban Development Department, GoM

