

TOWN PLANNING SCHEME, NAINA NO. 07

(Part of Villages of Devad, Vichumbe, Kolkhe Peth, Usarli Khurd, Shivkar, Tal. Panvel. Dist. Raigad)

PRELIMINARY SCHEME

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

Table A
Original Plot-wise Decisions of the Arbitrator

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
1	T.M.H. Staff & friends Co.Ho. Sco. Secretary, Ravindra Pahanu Ingale	Class I	(42/1/42/2A)	Devad	65	3,247	3	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing boundary of the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 3 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
2	T.M.H. Staff & friends Co.Ho. Sco. Secretary, Ravindra Pahanu Ingale	Class I	(42/1/42/2C)	Devad	67	766			
3	T.M.H. Staff & friends Co.Ho. Sco. Secretary, Ravindra Pahanu Ingale	Class I	(42/1/42/2D)	Devad	68	1,647			
4	T.M.H. Staff & friends Co.Ho. Sco. Secretary, Ravindra Pahanu Ingale	Class I	(42/1/42/2B)	Devad	66	2,000			
5	T.M.H. Staff & friends Co.Ho. Sco. Secretary, Ravindra Pahanu Ingale	Class I	(43(P)/1(P))	Devad	69	8,019			
6	T.M.H. Staff & friends Co.Ho. Sco. Secretary, Ravindra Pahanu Ingale	Class I	(43(P)/2(P))	Devad	70	-			
7	T.M.H. Staff & friends Co.Ho. Sco. Secretary, Ravindra Pahanu Ingale	Class I	(43(P)/3(P))	Devad	71	-			
8	T.M.H. Staff & friends Co.Ho. Sco. Secretary, Ravindra Pahanu Ingale	Class I	(44(P)/45/1 B/1(P))	Devad	72	4,261			
9	T.M.H. Staff & friends Co.Ho. Sco. Secretary, Ravindra Pahanu Ingale	Class I	(44(P)/45/1 B/2(P))	Devad	73	-			
10	T.M.H. Staff & friends Co.Ho. Sco. Secretary, Ravindra Pahanu Ingale	Class I	(44(P)/45/1 B/3(P))	Devad	74	-			
11	T.M.H. Staff & friends Co.Ho. Sco. Secretary, Ravindra Pahanu Ingale	Class I	(44(P)/45/1 B/4(P))	Devad	75	-			
12	Suresh D. Kolhe	Class I	(41/2)	Devad	64	2,000	4	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 4, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
13	Parshuram Dharma Waghmare, Bebibai Pandharinath Mhatre, Lilabai Shankar Patil, Savitribai Prakash gharat, Ramesh Gulab Chaudhari, Vijeta Laxmikant Sing, Jay Mata di Builders and Developers Behalf partner	Class I	(40/0)	Devad	62	2,480	7	Parshuram Waghmare & others submitted their representation dt. 24/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation-1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and to allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) The final plot shall be granted in their original land only. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 was sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 7 was proposed in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 40 and adjoining lands. The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing building in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 7 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
14	Vasant N. More	Class I	(36/2)	Devad	56	4,000	8	They have not appeared for a hearing but submitted representation dated 10/10/2023 Submission in representation- 1) They have not accepted the CIDCO's proposal of 40/60 plot allotment.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 8, as shown in the plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
15	M/s Shree Swaminathan Developers Behalf partner Prabhakar S. Sonawane, Sandip G. Waghmare	Class I	(38/2)	Devad	60	560	9	They submitted their representation dt. 25/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation-1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and to allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) They constructed an apartment building on their original land bearing survey no 38/2 with permission from Grampanchayat, Vichumbe on 25/11/2012 and also obtained a completion certificate from Grampanchayat Devad on 25/07/2016. The society is also formed with the name Swaminath Apartments Housing Society, so the said TPS scheme -7 is not applicable to them. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 was sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 9 was proposed in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 38/2 and adjoining lands. The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing building in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 9 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
16	Indu Nana Waghmare, Sunil Nana Waghmare, Dilip Nana Waghmare,	Class I	(39/0)	Devad	61	2,380	11	Indu Waghmare and others have submitted their representation dt. 24/07/2023 but did not appear	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 was sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
	vijay Nana Waghmare, Gulab Sunil Patil							for the hearing Submission in representation-1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and to allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) The final plot shall be granted in their original land only. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	the scheme, Final plot no 7 was proposed in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 39 and adjoining lands. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirement and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 11 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
17	M/s Prayag Gurukrupa builders Behalf partner Baburao Gajanan Mhatre, Pradip krushna bhopi, Narendra namdev dhadve, Virendre Hariba Lagade, Prajesh Sanjay Kamble	Class I	(33/0)	Devad	52	3,090	12	They requested to give 1 month time period to collect all documents, but thereafter did not submit any representation.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 was sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 12 was proposed in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 33 and adjoining lands. The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing building in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 12 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
18	Jagan Shankar Waghmare, Somi Tukaram Bhopi, Gomi Sgankar Mhatre, Parshuram Jayram Waghmare, Vishwas Jayram Waghmare, Manisha Mangesh bhagat, Janabai Changa Patil, Sonabai Jayram Waghmare	Class I	(31/0)	Devad	49	1,720	13A	Parshuram Waghmare submitted their representation dt. 24/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in hearing- 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 regarding the inclusion of them in the said scheme.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 was sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 13A was proposed in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 31, 34 and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in name of the owners, as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no. 13A, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
19	Jagan Shankar Waghmare, Somi Tukaram Bhopi, Gomi Sgankar Mhatre, Parshuram Jayram Waghmare, Vishwas Jayram Waghmare, Manisha Mangesh bhagat, Janabai Changa Patil, Sonabai Jayram Waghmare	Class II	(34/0)	Devad	53	2,500	13B	Parshuram Waghmare submitted their representation on 24/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in hearing- 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	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 was sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 13A was proposed in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 31, 34 and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in name of the owners, as per the



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								of the people, therefore raised their objection regarding the inclusion of them in the said scheme.	updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot no.13B, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
20	Virsen Kamlakar Sav, Paris Kunjavihar sav, Sandhya Kunjavihar Sav	Class I	(27/1C)	Devad	29	1,970	14, 55, 75	They appeared for a hearing on 27/07/2023 and also submitted their representation. Submission in hearing -1) Their property bearing survey no. 27/1C and 27/2A are located above the level of the Gadhi River and are never affected by the flood water. 2) In lieu of their original lands, final plots no 14, 55, and 75 have been proposed at another location. They requested that they be granted 2 final plots of equal sizes and out of that 1 shall be in the place of their existing house in survey no 27/2A for Smt. Sandhya Sao & Shri. Paris Kunjavihari Sao and second shall be adjoining to it for Virsen Sao. 3) They requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 4) 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. 5) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 6) 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.	Applicant's original land bearing Gut no. 27/1C & 27/2A are adjoining to Gad River and fall within its High Flood Line. NAINA has proposed holding ponds in the said land and therefore their request to grant final plots in their original land in place of their existing house cannot be accepted. Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land cannot be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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 requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 14, 55, & 75 have been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
21	Virsen Kamlakar Sav, Paris Kunjavihar sav, Sandhya Kunjavihar Sav	Class I	(27/2A)	Devad	30	23,170			
22	Vinod K. Patil	Class I	(37/2)	Devad	58	1,040	15	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
23	Nilesh Dashrath Devkar, Rupesh Nagnath Khanavkar, Anant Ramdas Waskar	Class I	(38/1)	Devad	59	2,600	16	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 16 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
24	Ashok Barku Waghmare, Gana Barku Waghmare, Raghunath Waghmare	Class I	(37/1)	Devad	57	2,170	17	Samadhan & Satyavan Ganesh Waghmare, heirs of Gana Barku Waghmare, submitted their representation on 31/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 was sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 17 was proposed in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 37/1 and




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								<p>Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and to allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) The final plot shall be granted in their original land only. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.</p>	<p>adjoining lands.</p> <p>The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing building in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 17 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area and name of the owners as shown in plan no. 4, to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.</p>
25	Malati Shankar Ramdharane, Naresh Shankar ramdharane, Parashuram Shankar Ramdharane, Vanita Shankar Ramdharane, Karuna Shankar Ramdharane, Jyoti Prakash Chandane, Surekha Shashikant Singasane	Class I	(27/1A/1)	Devad	27	6,020		<p>They submitted their representation on 31/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation -1) They have been granted final plot adm. 9384 sqm. Which is about 40% of their original holding. They requested to grant a final plot of at least 60% of their original holding. 2) The contribution amount of 5.18 crores as per form no. 1 is not accepted. 3) They also stated that an SLP case no 18909/2013 has been filed in Hon Supreme Court regarding said land on which Status Quo has been ordered. Therefore, TPS shall not be applicable for their lands till the final decision in the SLP. 4) There are existing houses along with 12 mango trees and 60 other trees of various species in their original property bearing survey no 27/1A/1 and their livelihood is dependent on their income.</p>	<p>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land cannot be considered. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. Final plot no 20 has been granted in part of Gut no 27/1 and adjoining lands.</p>
26	Malati Shankar Ramdharane, Naresh Shankar ramdharane, Parashuram Shankar Ramdharane, Vanita Shankar Ramdharane, Karuna Shankar Ramdharane, Jyoti Prakash Chandane, Surekha Shashikant Singasane	Class I	(27/2B)	Devad	31	17,440	20	<p>The Special Leave to Appeal (civil) 18909/2013 was filed in the Hon. Supreme Court of India against the High Court of Bombay Judgment and order dated 03/04/2013 in SA 1004/2007. Hon. Supreme Court wide order dated 04.07.2013 maintained status quo. From the High Court Judgement dt. 03.04.2013 in second Appeal no. 1004/2007, it is revealed that the appeal was filed against the Judgement and decree in the suit for partition and separate possession of the plaintiff's share in lands bearing Survey no. 27/1A & 27/2B of Devad village.</p> <p>As per Section 71 of the MR & TP Act, if a civil court passes any decree 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 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 subject to the final decision in the Special Leave to Appeal (civil) 18909/2013.</p> <p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed.</p>	



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									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.
27	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(10/0)	Devad	5	4,910	24, 129	<p>They appeared for a hearing on 10/08/2023 and also submitted their representation.</p> <p>Submission in Hearing -</p> <p>1. They requested SPA-NAINA for allotment of a single plot instead of their severally located plots under various survey no 10,11, 18/2, 20/2, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27/2D, 9/1/2, and 27/3 at village Devad, Survey No. 39/3, 110, 111, and 193/1 at village Vichumbe, Survey no. 105A, 107, 113, 27 at village Usarli Khurd, Survey no. 206/K of Shivkar and for that they have given consent also. The Director of Town Planning Pune in their report dated 15.03.2021 has recommended allotting a single plot to them instead of their various land holdings.</p> <p>2. They objected to the allotment of Final Plot No 24 and 26 at Village Devad which are allocated in No development area falling within the Blue line and Red line of the Gadi river. Also, the said allotted plot has existing structures on the plot</p> <p>3. Hon. Panvel Court has passed an order and decree dated 06/11/2020 for land-bearing survey no. 27/2/D owned by Malti Ramdhare and others of Devad for conveying the land in their name. Therefore requested to not allot the final plot till the outcome of the court process.</p> <p>4. Accordingly they have given 3 options for</p>	<p>1. Their original lands in Devad bearing Gut Nos. 10, 11, 18/2, 20/2, 21, 24, 25, 27/2D- 3 falls within the Blue line and Red line of Gadi River, and therefore Final Plot no. 24 & 26 were proposed in part of their original lands in sanctioned Draft Scheme. Therefore the said proposal is confirmed.</p> <p>2. As per their request for their other lands bearing Gut no. 39/3, 110, 111, and 193/1 at village Vichumbe, Gut no. 105A, 107, 113, 27 at village Usarli Khurd, Gut no. 206/K of Shivkar, Final plots no. 439, 441, 445, 449, & 467 are allotted in Usarli Khurd on part of their original lands bearing 105, 107, & 113.</p> <p>3. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 24, 439, 441, 445, 449, & 467 have been allotted with corrections in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.</p>
28	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(25/0)	Devad	25	960			
29	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(27/2D)	Devad	33	3,530			
30	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(27/3)	Devad	34	5,010			
31	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(18/2)	Devad	16	4,000			
32	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(11/0)	Devad	6	880			
33	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(20/2)	Devad	19	3,040			
34	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(21/0)	Devad	21	3,240			
35	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(24/0)	Devad	24	3,460			
36	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(39/3)	Vichumb e	130	16,840			
37	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(110/0)	Vichumb e	232	630			
38	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(111/0)	Vichumb e	233	3,290			
39	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(193/1)	Vichumb e	243	6,770			
40	Vijay Jagashi Cheda	Class I	(27/0)	Usarli Khurd	363	7,510			



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								allotment of a single plot or adjoining to their existing plots at village Usarli Khurd.	
41	Anil V. Thekekar, Pandurang G. Shedge, Dharma Aadekar, Paresh K. Gijje, Sunil M Aagri, Santosh D. Sonawane, Ramesh N. Soni, M/s galaxy Builders & Developers through partners Mahesh Somiskar, M/s maitri ahousing Prvt. Ltd. through Ajhar M. Khan, Om Shri Sai Dattanath Builders & Developers through Shital Sonawane, M/s Smail Intra Trade pvt. Ltd.	Class I	(26/0)	Devad	26	3,240	25	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no.25, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
42	Abhinav V. Cheda	Class I	(23/0)	Devad	23	2,150	26	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, Final Plot no.26, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
43	Atmaram Rama Bhoir, Eknath Rama bhoir, Ashok Bhau bhoir	Class I	(59/0)	Vichumb e	166	5,080	28	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to the change in the name of the owners. 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.
44	Chandrakant Shantilal Jain, shashikant Tuljaram Jadhav, Vinod Parasmal Palresha	Class I	(29/0)	Devad	46	1,260	42	They 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. Final Plot No. 42 as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
45	Prafulkumar Manjibhai Kapupara urfa Patel, Janardan Maruti Phadke, Bhagwan Kanu Phadke, Raghunath urfa Eknath Maruti Phadke	Class I	(30/2)	Devad	48	4,400	43	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 43 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in the plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
46	Parashram Dharma Waghmare, Bhagibai Maruti Patil, Baliram Narayan Waghmare, Namdev Narayan Waghmare, Godabai Dhau Patil, Shalu Bhagwan Patil, Tai Narayan Chaudhari,	Class II	(27/1B)	Devad	28	4,050	45	They submitted their representation on 25/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. As per Section 71 of the MR & TP Act, if a civil court passes any decree in a disputed claim of the




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
	Shalik Dhau waghmare, Rambhau Dhau waghmare, Lila Dhau Waghmare, Nirmala Dhau waghmare, Sunil Dhau waghmare, Bami Budhaji Mhatre, Gulab Krushna Mhatre, Bhaskar Krushna Mhatre, Shashikant Krushna Waghmare, Sangita Dinanath Phadke, Sulochna gopal Gaykar, Mali Bhau Gharat, shaila Kisan waghmare, Radhabai Padmakar Patil, Suman Kisan Gharat, Vaman Ganapat Waghmare, arun Ganapat Waghmare, Uttam Ganapat waghmare, Sandip Ganapat Waghmare, Nanda Ganapat Waghmare							CIDCO and to allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) The final plot shall be granted in their original land only. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7. 6) Regarding the said survey no 27/1B, regular suit no 234/2021 has been filed in Panvel Civil Court.	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 have been suitably corrected/varied because of such decree. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
47	M/s Best Enterprises, Chandrakant Shantilal Jain, Shashikant Tuljaram Jhadhav, Vinod Parasmal Palresha, Sita Vitthal Patil, Gita Pandhari Mhatre, Lata Ananta Waghmare, Shevanti baban patil	Class I	(32/2)	Devad	51	1,690	46	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 46, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B
48	M/s Best Enterprises, Chandrakant Jain, Shashikant Jhadhav, Vinod Palresha	Class I	(9/3)	Devad	3	2,500	48, 50	They submitted their representation on 25/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation-1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) The final plot shall be granted in their original land only. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 47 has been allotted at the location of part of their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
49	Chandrakant Shantilal jain, shashikant Tuljaram Jadhav, vinod Parasmal Palresha	Class I	(32/1)	Devad	50	6,070			
50	Shashikant Krushnaji Patil, Nandini Ankush Shinde	Class I	(41/1)	Devad	63	5,000			
51	Bhagwan Rama Waghmare	Class I	(9/2)	Devad	2	2,600	49	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 49 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
52	Shalik Dhau Waghmare, Rambhau dhau Waghmare, Sunil Dhau Waghmare, Lilabai Dhau Waghmare, Nirmala Dhau Waghmare, Praful Kumar Manajibhai	Class I	(30/1)	Devad	47	5,060	51	They submitted their representation on 25/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation-1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The layout of the scheme has been revised for

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
	Kapupara Patel, Vaman Ganapat Waghmare							CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) The final plot shall be granted in their original land only. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	planning requirements and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 51 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
53	Krupa Anil Patil, Laxman Bashya Gharat, Shekhar D. Jadhav, Mohan N. Shetty, Ramdas gavtya Waghmare, Pandurang Gavtya Waghmare, Vijay J. Cheda	Class I	(9/1)	Devad	1	16,770	52	Pandurang & Ramdas Waghmare submitted their representation on 25/07/2023. Submission in hearing and representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) The final plot shall be granted in their original land only. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7. 6) They have filed Regular Civil Suit no. 72/09 in the court of Civil Judge, Sr. Division, Panvel for the ownership of land bearing Survey No. 9/1(1), and in order below EXH 5 in the said suit, Hon Court has restrained defendants from dispossessing the plaintiff and from selling the suit property to anybody till the decision of the suit.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the MR & TP Act, 1966 provisions. In this case, Shri. Ramdas Waghmare and Pandurang Waghmare have filed Regular Civil Suit no. 72/09 in the court of Civil Judge, Sr. Division, Panvel for the ownership of land bearing Survey No. 9/1(1), and in order below EXH 5 in the said suit, Hon Court has restrained defendants from dispossessing the plaintiff and from selling the suit property to anybody till the decision of the suit. As per Section 71 of the MR & TP Act, if a civil court passes any decree 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 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 subject to the final decision in the Regular Civil Appeal no. 72/2009 in the Court of Civil Judge, Panvel. As per the updated 7/12 extract, the original Gut no. 9/1 has been subdivided into 9/1/A & 9/1/B. Therefore the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 52A & 52B have been allotted at the location of part of their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
54	Padmini V Jadhav, Vilas R. Jadhav	Class I	(12/0)	Devad	7	480	56	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot no. 56, as shown in plan no 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
55	Padmini V Jadhav, Vilas R. Jadhav	Class I	(13/0)	Devad	8	660			
56	Shashikant K. Patil	Class I	(9/4)	Devad	4	4,000	58	They submitted their representation on 21/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation-1) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS-7. 2) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection regarding the inclusion of them in the said scheme. 3) They have requested to allot a Final plot at the location of their original property bearing Gut no 9/4. 4) The contribution amount is to be waived.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 58 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 9 and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to the correction in the name of the owners as per the updated 7/12 extract. 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.
57	Santosh S. Asavale, Sandhya S. Bhoir, Sanjay V Mhatre	Class I	(15/0)	Devad	10	1,690	60	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 60 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
58	Roshan G. Karambera, Aalekwadi G. Karambera, Vasudev S. Kamat, Darshak S. Siddha	Class I	(14/0)	Devad	9	2,630	62	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 62 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in the plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
59	Bhagya S. Lahane	Class I	(20/1)	Devad	18	660	63	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 63 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in the plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
60	Namdev B Phadke	Class I	(16/0)	Devad	11	1,720	65	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 65 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
61	Shobhana B. Ghate, Jomibai V. Bhoir, Sulabai R. Govari	Class II	(20/3)	Devad	20	600	66	They appeared for a hearing on 25/07/2023 and also submitted their representation. Submission in hearing and representation- 1) They agreed to the location and shape of the proposed final plot no 66. 2) They 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. 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-7, 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-7. 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. 66, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
62	Sajjan Singh Yadav	Class I	(27/2C)	Devad	32	3,740	67	They appeared for a hearing on 25/07/2023 and also submitted their representation. Submission in hearing and representation- 1) They have agreed to the location of the proposed final plot no 67 but have requested to allot a regular-shaped (square/rectangular) final plot instead of the current proposed irregularly shaped plot. 2) They 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. 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-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% of the original land cannot be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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. 67, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
63	Kokila K. Patel, Sonal K. Patel	Class I	(22/0)	Devad	22	5,500	70	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted the representation	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 70, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
64	Kokila K. Patel, Sonal K. Patel	Class I	(18/1)	Devad	15	6,100	71	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted the representation	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 71, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
65	Rohini D. Bankar, Anita D. Bankar, Nalina D. Bankar, Anjana D. Bankar	Class I	(18/3A)	Devad	13	2,880	73	They appeared for a hearing on 26/07/2023 Submission in hearing-	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								1) They agreed to the location and shape of the proposed final plot no. 73. 2) They 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. 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.	minimum of 60% of the original land cannot be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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. 73, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
66	Ramesh Alya Gondhali, Suresh Alya Gondhali, Rajesh D Gondhali, Gita Nitin Patil, Kamala D Gondhali, Harsh V. Gondhali, Harshali V. Gondhali, Pinki V. Gondhali	Class I	(193/2)	Vichumb e	244	1,700	74	They submitted their representation on 26/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) The final plot shall be granted in their original land only. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 74 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 193 and adjoining lands. The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 74 has been allotted at the location of part of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in the plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
67	Radhabai C. Bankar, Prakash C. Bankar, Kishar G. Surate, Dhananjay L. Patil	Class I	(18/3B)	Devad	14	400	76	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted the representation	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 76 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in the plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
68	Genu Chandar Bhingarkar, Shantabai Kashinath Keni, Suman Keni, Kanta Bharat Keni, Rami Bandu Patil, Sundar Lakshamn Bhoir	Class II	(224/0)	Vichumb e	281	2,480	79	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted the representation	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 79A has been allotted in part of their original plot with correction in the area and the ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
69	Ambo B Surte Yadnyeshvar S. Patil	Class I	(195/1)	Vichumb e	246	4,310	80	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted the representation	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to the change in the name of the owners as per updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 80, as shown in plan No. 4, has been

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
70	Shivam Co. Ho. Sco.	Class I	(195/3)	Vichumb e	248	8,000	81	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted the representation	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 81 has been allotted at the location of part of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
71	Ambo B Surte	Class I	(195/4)	Vichumb e	249	5,890	83	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted the 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. 83, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
72	Nilkant Construction Kishor Krishankant Gupate, Maganbhai Nanabhai Patel, Jayesh Chimanlal Soneta, Gopal Devaram Choudhari, Bhavana Bhavin Gadiya, Bhagchand Chuvdamal Khubchandani	Class I	(195/2)	Vichumb e	247	2,000	84	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted the representation	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 84 has been allotted at the location of part of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
73	Nilkant Construction Kishor Krishankant Gupate, Maganbhai Nanabhai Patel, Jayesh Chimanlal Soneta, Gopal Devaram Choudhari, Bhavana Bhavin Gadiya, Bhagchand Chuvdamal Khubchandani	Class I	(196/0)	Vichumb e	250	4,780			
74	Nilkant Construction Kishor Krishankant Gupate, Maganbhai Nanabhai Patel, Jayesh Chimanlal Soneta, Gopal Devaram Choudhari, Bhavana Bhavin Gadiya, Bhagchand Chuvdamal Khubchandani	Class I	(197/0)	Vichumb e	251	450			
75	Nilkant Construction Kishor Krishankant Gupate, Maganbhai Nanabhai Patel, Jayesh Chimanlal Soneta, Gopal Devaram Choudhari, Bhavana Bhavin Gadiya, Bhagchand Chuvdamal Khubchandani	Class I	(201/1)	Vichumb e	256	4,020			
76	Nilkant Construction Kishor Krishankant Gupate, Maganbhai Nanabhai Patel, Jayesh Chimanlal Soneta, Gopal Devaram Choudhari, Bhavana Bhavin Gadiya, Bhagchand Chuvdamal Khubchandani	Class I	(200/0)	Vichumb e	255	600			




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
77	Shree Shankar Devsthan Vichumbe, Keshav Kana Bhingarkar, Gangabai Chahu Bhingarkar, Vijay Chahu Bhingarkar, Vishawas Chahu Bhingarkar, Kalibai chandrakant Patil, Sakharibai chandrakant Govari, Kundabai Suresh Bhingarkar, Rajesh Suresh Bhingarkar, Amita Vishawas Govari, Sangita Patil, Sudhir Janardan Keni, Prasad Rajendra Keni, Anil Janardan Keni, Aruna Rajendra Keni, Shobha Janardan Keni, Maribai Rajendra Keni	Class I	(199/0)	Vichumb e	254	1,210	85	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted the representation	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 85 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in the plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
78	M/s Luniya Relativity Partnership Firm behalf partner Vinod Gangaram Jaina	Class I	(203/0)	Vichumb e	262	4,170	87+88	They appeared for a hearing on 26/07/2023 and also submitted their representation. Submission in hearing and representation- 1) They have an under-construction project on their original land bearing survey no 203 with all the permission including NA order from the Collector. One of their building is almost ready and the second one is under construction. 2) In their approved plan, there is a 9 m existing road and 3 m proposed road widening on both sides, totalling 15 mt road. But the TP scheme shows a 3 m existing road and a 12 m setback in their plot. 3) Accordingly, they requested to honour the CC and use 3 m as a setback instead of 12 m.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 87 has been allotted at the location of part of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
79	Shree Shankar Devsthan Vichumbe, Krushna Dharma Bhingarkar, Vasudev Dharma Bhingarkar	Class I	(198/1)	Vichumb e	252	1,240	89	Vasudev Bhingarkar submitted their representation on 26/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 89, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
80	Shree Shankar Devsthan Vichumbe, Krushna Dharma Bhingarkar, Vasudev Dharma Bhingarkar	Class I	(198/2)	Vichumb e	253	530		Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) The final plot shall be granted in their original land only. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
81	Rajendra H. Padate	Class I	(207/1)	Vichumb e	264	940	91	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per the updated 7/12 extract, the ownership of the original land bearing Gut No. 207/1 has been changed. Therefore the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 91A & 91B have been allotted at the location of part of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
82	Rajendra H. Padate	Class I	(207/2)	Vichumb e	265	1,010			
83	Anant Chahu Mohite, Manohar Chau Surate, Nirmala Gajanan Surate, Kishor Gajanan Surate, Ghanayam Gajanan Surate, Namrata Mangesh Patil	Class II	(217/0)	Vichumb e	279	1,200	92	They submitted their representation on 26/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) The final plot shall be granted in their original land only. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 92 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 217 and adjoining lands. 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.
84	Anant Sakham Sawant, Chandrakant B. Mohite	Class I	(128(P)/2(P))	Vichumb e	241	316	93	They 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, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
85	Genu Chandar Bhingarkar, Shantabai Kashinath Keni, Suman Keni, Kanta Bharat Keni, Rami Bandu Patil, Sundar Lakshamn Bhoir	Class II	(201/3)	Vichumb e	258	450	95	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 95 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
86	Amba Parabat Patel, Jivraj Parabat Gajora, Muraji Deva Patel, Hiraji Keshav Patel, Hiraji laxman Patel, Govinda meghaji patel, Rohit hiraji Patel, Naina enterprises	Class I	(201/4)	Vichumb e	259	1,090	96	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per the updated 7/12 extract, the ownership of the original lands has been changed. Therefore the proposed final plot no 96 in the sanctioned draft scheme is divided and Final plot no 96A has been granted to original land no. 201/4, 212/1 & 4, 216/1, 2, & 3. Final plot no 96B has been granted to Gut no. 212/2 Final Plot No. 96A & 96B, as shown in plan No. 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
87	Amba Parabat Patel, Jivraj Parabat Gajora, Muraji Deva Patel, Hiraji Keshav Patel, Hiraji laxman Patel, Govinda meghaji patel, Rohit hiraji Patel, Naina enterprises	Class I	(216/2)	Vichumb e	277	3,420			



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
88	Amba Parabat Patel, Jivraj Parabat Gajora, Muraji Deva Patel, Hiraji Keshav Patel, Hiraji laxman Patel, Govinda meghaji patel, Rohit hiraji Patel, Naina enterprises	Class I	(212/1)	Vichumb e	270	440			
89	Amba Parabat Patel, Jivraj Parabat Gajora, Muraji Deva Patel, Hiraji Keshav Patel, Hiraji laxman Patel, Govinda meghaji patel, Rohit hiraji Patel, Naina enterprises	Class I	(212/4)	Vichumb e	273	403			
90	Amba Parabat Patel, Jivraj Parabat Gajora, Muraji Deva Patel, Hiraji Keshav Patel, Hiraji laxman Patel, Govinda meghaji patel, Rohit hiraji Patel, Naina enterprises	Class I	(216/1)	Vichumb e	276	810			
91	Amba Parabat Patel, Jivraj Parabat Gajora, Muraji Deva Patel, Hiraji Keshav Patel, Hiraji laxman Patel, Govinda meghaji patel, Rohit hiraji Patel, Naina enterprises	Class I	(216/3)	Vichumb e	278	300			
92	Amba Parabat Patel, Jivraj Parabat Gajora, Muraji Deva Patel, Hiraji Keshav Patel, Hiraji laxman Patel, Govinda meghaji patel, Rohit hiraji Patel, Naina enterprises	Class I	(212/2)	Vichumb e	271	450			
93	Gangavihar Infrakon LLP Tarfe Kishor Kaluram Choudhari, Tikaram virnaji Choudhari, Mayank A. Dhakad, Yogesh Durgaram Choudhari, Rohit Hiraji Patel	Class I	(127(P)/0)	Vichumb e	240	410	97	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
94	Anant Chahu Mohite, Manohar chau Surate, Nirmala Gagajan Surate, Kishor Gajanan Surate, Ghanayam Gajanan Surate, Namrata mangesh Patil, Chandrashekhar Giradharbhai Darji, Vijaykumar Motiram Udasi, Sunil Motiram Udasi	Class I	(218/1)	Vichumb e	280	12,770	100	Shri Chandrashekhar Darji on behalf of himself and Vijakumar Udasi and Sunil Udasi appeared for hearing on 26/07/2023. Submission in hearing - 1) They stated that out of the total 12770 sqm. Area of survey no 218/1, 6050 sqm. is owned by them and the remaining 6720 sqm. is owned by Anant Chau Mohite, Manohar D Surte, and others. 2) For the entire original land of survey no 218/1, final plot no 100 has been proposed, wherein houses/structures of Anant Mohite and Manohar Surte exist. 3) Therefore, they requested that a separate vacant final plot be granted for their holding adm. 6050 sqm. 4) Permissible 1.00 FSI of the original plot shall be allowed to be consumed on the final plot. Also, unconsumed	Gut no. 218/1 is jointly owned by Anant Mohite, Manohar Surte & other 3, Chandrashekhar Darji, Vijaykumar Udasi & 1 another. Therefore their request to grant separate plots cannot be accepted. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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 requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 100 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								<p>FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 5) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 6) 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>Anant Chau Mohite, Manohar Chau Surte, and others have given the following submission on 26/07/2023</p> <p>1) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS-7. 2) The said NAINA TPS is inconsistent with the law and against the interest of the people, therefore raised their objection regarding the inclusion of them in the said scheme. 3) The final plot is allotted in another location whereas the final plot should be allotted in our original plot. 4) The contribution amount is to be waived.</p>	the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
95	Janardan D. Mhatre, Sadanand D. Mhatre, Jaydas D. Mhatre, Manoraj D. Mhatre	Class I	(77/0)	Vichumb e	189	16,820	102	<p>They submitted their representation on 02/05/2023 but did not appear for the hearing Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them and to levy the betterment charges is not acceptable. 2) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.</p>	<p>Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme.</p> <p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 102 has been allotted with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.</p>
96	Kanha C. Patil	Class I	(212/3)	Vichumb e	272	477	103	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
97	Yakub Beg Trust Panvel	Class I	(201/2)	Vichumb e	257	610	104	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 104 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in the plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
98	Yakub Beg Trust Panvel	Class I	(201/5)	Vichumb e	260	610			



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
99	Shridhar K. Bhoir	Class I	(54/2C/3)	Vichumb e	161	3,000	106	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 129B has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
100	Manoj H. Padate	Class I	(206/0)	Vichumb e	263	2,380	107	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 107 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
101	Manoj H. Padate	Class I	(208/0)	Vichumb e	266	2,330			
102	Dhau L. Bhingarkar	Class I	(209/0)	Vichumb e	267	1,190	108	They submitted their representation on 14/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation -1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 108 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 209 and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
103	Shashikala R. Devkar	Class I	(211/0)	Vichumb e	269	780	109	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 109 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
104	Bama Jairam Bhoir	Class I	(215/3)	Vichumb e	275	150	111	They 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. 111, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
105	Sunil Duklya Sonawale	Class I	(9/3)	Vichumb e	84	610	113	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
106	Krushna Dharma Bhingarkar, Vasudev Dharma Bhingarkar	Class I	(51/0)	Vichumb e	149	1,870	114	They submitted their representation on 26/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								<p>Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7.</p>	<p>MR & TP Act, 1966. In the sanctioned development plan of NAINA, their original land bearing Gut no. 51 of village Vichumbe is under the reservation of Growth Centre and therefore they have been granted the final plot at another location in the same village fronting on 12.0 mt. wide layout road. 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. 114, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
107	Ramdas Kathod Bhoir, Dattatray Kathod Bhoir, Laxmibai Kathod Bhoir, Nami Harichanra Bhoir	Class II	(9/1)	Vichumb e	82	2,150	115	They 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. 115, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
108	Ramdas Naga Mhatre	Class I	(136(P)/0)	Usarli Khurd	501	2,476	116	They 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. 116, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
109	Anup V. Kamble, Anil V. Kamble, Rajendra S. Kamble, Vasant A. Raut, Shrikrushana A. Bangare, Prabhakar N. Tayade	Class I	(10/0)	Vichumb e	85	504	117	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 117, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
110	Ram J. Mhatre	Class I	(10/3)	Vichumb e	88	163			
111	MacMohan Paul	Class I	(10/2)	Vichumb e	87	162			
112	Vasant A. Raut	Class I	(10/1)	Vichumb e	86	168			
113	Rajendra S. Kamble	Class I	(10/4)	Vichumb e	89	166			
114	Prabhakar N. Tayade	Class I	(10/5)	Vichumb e	90	821			
115	Anup V. Kamble, Anil V. Kamble	Class I	(10/6)	Vichumb e	91	166			
116	Namdev B. Phadke, Kaluram B. Dundrekar	Class II	(12/0)	Vichumb e	93	2,150	118	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no.118 has been allotted in part of their original plot with correction in the area</p>




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
117	Namdev B. Phadke, Eknath D. Bhoir, Kashinath Bhoir, Ganesh D. Bhoir, Shailaja J. Bhoir, Pratik J. Bhoir	Class I	(13/0)	Vichumb e	94	2,500	119	They submitted their representation on 27/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them and to levy betterment charges is not acceptable. 4) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 119 has been allotted in part of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
118	Namdev Balu Phadke	Class I	(14/0)	Vichumb e	95	2,880	120	They neither appeared for hearing not submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 120 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
119	Shree Shankar devasthan vichumbe Vahivatdar, Krushna Dharma Bhingarkar, Vasudev Dharma bhingarkar	Class I	(52/0)	Vichumb e	150	1,240	121	They submitted their representation on 26/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the sanctioned development plan of NAINA, their original land bearing Gut no. 52 of village Vichumbe is under the reservation of Growth Centre and therefore they have been granted the final plot at another location in the same village fronting on 20.0 mt. & 12.0 mt. wide layout roads. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 121, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
120	Pramod S. Bhingarkar, Dhau L. Bhingarkar, Pravin V. Chimne	Class I	(11/0)	Vichumb e	92	2,400	122	They submitted their representation on 14/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation - 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme	Draft Town Planning Scheme no.7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 122 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no-11 around their structure and adjoining lands. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 122, as shown in plan No. 4, has been


Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								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-7.	allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
121	Kamlakar C. Dundrekar, Karuna N. Bhoir, Bharti S. Gondhali, Ratan C. Govari, Ram G. Dundrekar, Sandip L. Govari, Hasuram G. Dundrekar, Hirabai P. Bhoir, Radhibai C. Dundrekar, Priyanka S. Dundrekar, Sukanya C. Patil, Sunita Y. Patil, Anjali N. Dundrekar, Amita R. Dalvekar, Sadhna R. Dhokare, Sandip Dundrekar, Sarita S. Bhagat, Uttam N. Dundrekar, Sangita R. Govari, Parvi S. Dundrekar, Sita N. Dundrekar	Class II	(9/2)	Vichumb e	83	2,600	123	They 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. 123, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
122	Ramdas Nagya Mhatre	Class II	(126/0)	Vichumb e	239	180	124	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 124, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
123	Sharad Jagannath Bhingarkar, Subhash Maya Bhingarkar, Damaji Raghunath Bhingarakar, Jagadish Maya Bhingarkar, Pandit Maya Bhingarkar, Varsha Jitendra Mundkar, Rajashri Maya Bhingarkar	Class II	(54/1C)	Vichumb e	154	1,800	126	They submitted their representation on 27/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the sanctioned development plan of NAINA, their original land bearing Gut no. 54 of village Vichumbe is under the reservation of Growth Centre and therefore they have been granted the final plot at another location in the same village fronting on 12.0 mt. wide layout road. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 126, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
124	Jani B. Govari, Manda M. Patil, Manik S. Bhoir, Kamla R. Bhoir, Alka D. Pardeshi, Chaya G. Pardeshi, Dilip Munga Mundkar, Shamabai M. Mundkar, Aanata N. Bhoir, Vaman G. Mundkar	Class I	(8/0)	Vichumb e	81	2,550	127	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 127, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
125	Kaluram C. Patil, Shivdas C. Patil, Bhaskar R. Patil, Santosh R. Patil, Anant R. Patil	Class I	(90/0)	Vichumb e	204	4,200	128	They submitted their representation on 12/10/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) CIDCO's proposal to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) They requested to grant final plot measuring 60 % of their land in their original land only.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 128, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
126	Hirabai Pandurang Bhoir, Kamlakar Changya Dundrekar, Karuna Naresh Bhoir, Janardan Ambo Dundrekar, Pradip Lakshaman Govari, Bala Ambo Dundrekar, Budhya Ambo Dundrekar, Bharti sham gondhali, ratan chaya Govari, Radhibai changya Dundrekar, Ram gana Dundrekar, Suresh Gana Dundrekar, Sandip Lakshman Govari, Hasuram Gana Dundrekar, Dhaya Ambo Dundrekar, Priyanka Shankar Dundrekar, Sukanya Chetan Patil, Sunita Yashvant Patil, Anjali Namdev Dundrekar, Amita Ravindra Davlekar, Sadhana Rupesh Dhokare, Sandip Namdev Dundrekar, Sarita Sanjay Bhagat, Uttam Namdev Dundrekar, Sangita Ganesh Patil, Sanjya Ramesh Govari, Parvati Shankar Dundrekar, Sitabai Namdev Dundrekar	Class I	(37/0)	Vichumb e	125	860	130	They 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.
127	Krushna Dharma Bhingarkar, Vasudev Dharma Bhingarkar	Class I	(36/2)	Vichumb e	122	1,340	132	They submitted their representation on 26/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 132 has been granted in part of their original holdings bearing Gut no 36/2 and adjoining lands.
128	Krushna Dharma Bhingarkar, Vasudev Dharma Bhingarkar	Class I	(36/4)	Vichumb e	124	200			The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
129	Damaji Raghunath Bhingarkar, Meghanath Raghunath Bhingarkar, Janabai Kashinath Patil, Kanta Aniruddha Govari, Shanta Balaram	Class II	(36/3)	Vichumb e	123	480	133	They submitted their representation on 26/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the scheme, Final plot no 132 has been granted in part of their original



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
	Gondhali, Shubhangi Rajaram Bhagat, Sangita Raghunath Bhingarkar							decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2)NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7.	holdings and adjoining lands. The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 133 has been allotted with corrections in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
130	Padu Hari Bhopi, Namdev Tukaram Bhopi, Gomi tukaram Bhopi, Jayavanti Ramdas Bhopi, Suresh Ramdas Bhopi. Bharati Ramdas Bhopi, jitendra Ramdas Bhopi, Reshma Ramdas Bhopi, Kanha Chandrakant Patil, Jayendra Chandrakant Patil, Suman Subhash Patil, Pritesh Subhash Patil, Vikas Subhash Patil, Ranjana Santosh Patil, Varun Santosh Patil, Nayan Santosh Patil	Class II	(7/0)	Vichumb e	80	1,670	256	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to the change in the name of the owners as per the updated 7/12 extract. Final Plot No. 256, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
131	Padu Hari Bhopi, Namdev Tukaram Bhopi, Gomi tukaram Bhopi, Jayavanti Ramdas Bhopi, Suresh Ramdas Bhopi. Bharati Ramdas Bhopi, jitendra Ramdas Bhopi, Reshma Ramdas Bhopi, Kanha Chandrakant Patil, Jayendra Chandrakant Patil, Suman Subhash Patil, Pritesh Subhash Patil, Vikas Subhash Patil, Ranjana Santosh Patil, Varun Santosh Patil, Nayan Santosh Patil	Class II	(36/1)	Vichumb e	121	2,790			
132	Padu Hari Bhopi, Namdev Tukaram Bhopi, Gomi tukaram Bhopi, Jayavanti Ramdas Bhopi, Suresh Ramdas Bhopi. Bharati Ramdas Bhopi, jitendra Ramdas Bhopi, Reshma Ramdas Bhopi, Kanha Chandrakant Patil, Jayendra Chandrakant Patil, Suman Subhash Patil, Pritesh Subhash Patil, Vikas Subhash Patil, Ranjana Santosh Patil, Varun Santosh Patil, Nayan Santosh Patil	Class II	(42/0)	Vichumb e	134	1,470			



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
133	Padu Hari Bhopi, Namdev Tukaram Bhopi, Gomi tukaram Bhopi, Jayavanti Ramdas Bhopi, Suresh Ramdas Bhopi. Bharati Ramdas Bhopi, jitendra Ramdas Bhopi, Reshma Ramdas Bhopi, Kanha Chandrakant Patil, Jayendra Chandrakant Patil, Suman Subhash Patil, Pritesh Subhash Patil, Vikas Subhash Patil, Ranjana Santosh Patil, Varun Santosh Patil, Nayan Santosh Patil	Class I	(92/0)	Vichumb e	206	2,330	134	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 134 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
134	Padu Hari Bhopi, Namdev Tukaram Bhopi, Gomi tukaram Bhopi, Jayavanti Ramdas Bhopi, Suresh Ramdas Bhopi. Bharati Ramdas Bhopi, jitendra Ramdas Bhopi, Reshma Ramdas Bhopi, Kanha Chandrakant Patil, Jayendra Chandrakant Patil, Suman Subhash Patil, Pritesh Subhash Patil, Vikas Subhash Patil, Ranjana Santosh Patil, Varun Santosh Patil, Nayan Santosh Patil	Class I	(233/0)	Vichumb e	282	2,070			
135	Padu Hari Bhopi, Namdev Tukaram Bhopi, Gomi tukaram Bhopi, Jayavanti Ramdas Bhopi, Suresh Ramdas Bhopi. Bharati Ramdas Bhopi, jitendra Ramdas Bhopi, Reshma Ramdas Bhopi, Kanha Chandrakant Patil, Jayendra Chandrakant Patil, Suman Subhash Patil, Pritesh Subhash Patil, Vikas Subhash Patil, Ranjana Santosh Patil, Varun Santosh Patil, Nayan Santosh Patil	Class I	(124(P)/0)	Vichumb e	235	610			
136	Anna Nama Gayakwad, Vishnu Nama Gayakwad, Vatsalabai Ragho urf Raghunath Gayakwad, Rajesh Raghunath Gayakwad, Sujata Raghunath Gayakwad, Vijay raghunath Gayakwad, Ramesh Goma Gayakwad, Gunabai Goma Gayakwad, Kalpana Goma Gayakwad, Vandana Goma Gayakwad, Lila Eknath Gayakwad, Pramila Vinay Gayakwad, Chhaya Prakash Gayakwad, Sundara Dattu Gayakwad, Prashant Dattu Gayakwad, Asmita Dattu Gayakwad, Priyanka	Class I	(34/0)	Vichumb e	120	2,730	135	Adv Paresh Gaikwad submitted their representation on 05/10/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) CIDCO's proposal to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) They are cultivating their land for many years and have farm house in Gut no. 63/2. Therefore requested to retain their land for agriculture purpose only.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 135, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
	Dattu Gayakwad, Suhasini Balkrushna Gayakwad, Gita Ganesh Gade, Vicky Ganesh Gade, Diksha Ganesh Gade, Aparna Siddharth Sonawane, Ashwini Anil Babare, maruti Dharma Gayakwad, Rupesh Keshav Gayakwad, Paresh Keshav Gayakwad, Subhash Govind Gayakwad, Krushnabai Govind Gayakwad, Santosh Dharma Gayakwad, Kamla Dharma Gayakwad, Ranjana Gana Gayakwad, Jayashri Dipak Nikalaje, Babu Gana Gayakwad								
137	Minnath Ramchandra Patil, Sudam Sitaram Patil, Keshav Sitaram Patil, Krushnabai Dattatreya Patil, Baliram Dattatreya Patil, Ram Dattatreya Patil, Bharat Dattatreya patil, Urmila Dilip Mundkar, Vanita Harishchandra Bhagat, Aakash Krushna Patil, Avinash Krushna Patil, Akshata Krushna Patil	Class I	(15/A)	Vichumb e	96	3,550	137	They submitted their representation on 02/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allotment of remaining 40% of land to them and levy of contribution amount is not acceptable. 2) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 137 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
138	Shankar Pandurang Patil	Class I	(15/B)	Vichumb e	97	2,140	138	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 138 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
139	Lahu N Waghmare, Suresh N Waghmare, Prakash N Waghmare, Ravi N Waghmare, Jijabai D shedge, Uma N Waghmare, Santosh A Waghmare, Pamabai A Waghmare, Sandhya B Patil	Class II	(73(P)/0)	Devad	77	234	140	They submitted their representation on 27/07/2023 and 31/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 140, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
140	Sunanda N. Surte, Bhagesh N. Surte, Janhavi J. Bhingarkar, Neha D. Goyal	Class I	(19/2A)	Vichumb e	104	3,000	141	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	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
141	Malati M. Pandare	Class I	(67/0)	Vichumb e	183	1,060	142	They 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 to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B
142	M/s Prayag Realty through partners Bhikhabhai Madat, Jitesh Agrawal	Class I	(19/1A/1)	Vichumb e	98	2,000	143	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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
143	Sangita Dhanraj Vispute, Dhanraj Devidas Vispute	Class I	(103/0)	Devad	79	2,400	144	They 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. 144, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
144	Vishvnath B. Surte, Janabai P. Surte, Naamdev B. Surte, Vithabai K. Patil, Yamuna N. Surte, Revati N. Surte, Rajashri N. Surte, Tejashri N. Surte, Bhagyashri N. Surte, Mayuri N. Surte, Nishikant N. Surte, Dharmi B. Surte, Maya B. Surte, Sanjivani N. Surte	Class I	(19/1A/5)	Vichumb e	102	1,500	148	They submitted their representation on 26/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 148, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
145	Sachin Omprakash Agrwal	Class I	(25(P)/0)	Vichumb e	110	1,790	149	They 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.
146	Jomibai D. Surte, Santosh D. Surte, Anjira S. Govari, Dipak D. Surte, Jomi R. Patil, Sunil R. Patil, Tai D. Govari, Samus R. patil, Ranjan Patil, Padibai Mundkar, Kamlakar N. patil, Goma N. Patil, Nagesh N. patil, Dharmi N. Patil, Manda C. bhagat, Poshhi B. Mundkar, Alka K. Keni, Uttam Pardehshi, Chahubai B. Patil, Chandrabai R.	Class I	(19/1A/4)	Vichumb e	101	2,550	151	They submitted their representation on 28/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. 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 regarding the inclusion of them in the said scheme.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 151, as shown in plan No. 4, has been



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
	Govari, Shravan B. Patil, Nagin B. Patil, Prashant Pardeshi, Pralhad B. Patil, Rajendra B. Patil, Sagar B. Patil, Subhas R. Patil, Pramila P. Govari								allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
147	Pradip K. Bhopi	Class I	(19/1A/3)	Vichumb e	100	2,600	152	They 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.
148	Sai Chirag Infra Project Pvt. Ltd.	Class I	(19/1B)	Vichumb e	103	4,000	153	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 153 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
149	Sai Chirag Infra Project Pvt. Ltd.	Class I	(19/2B)	Vichumb e	105	1,680			
150	Vishvnath B. Surte, Kalibai M. Surte, Hiranman M. Surte, Janhavi D. Surte, Hiranman M. Surte, Sunita M. bhangarkar, Sunita M. Bhingarkar, Mangala Bhingarkar, Vanita J. Bhoir	Class I	(19/1A/2)	Vichumb e	99	4,620	154	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 154 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
151	Yakub Beg Trust Panvel, Alhaj m. Mustafa Yakub Beg- chief trusty, Yusufkhan akabar Khan, Imran Salim Khan, allabaksha Appalal, mulla, M. Tasalim Mahamad husen	Class I	(50/0)	Vichumb e	148	3,820	155	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements. As per the updated 7/12 extract, the proposed Final Plot No. 155 has been divided into 155A for Gut no 50/0 and Final Plot no 155B for Gut No. 32/0.
152	Yakub Beg Trust Panvel, Alhaj m. Mustafa Yakub Beg- chief trusty, Yusufkhan akabar Khan, Imran Salim Khan, allabaksha Appalal, mulla, M. Tasalim Mahamad husen	Class I	(32/0)	Vichumb e	118	3,950		They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	
153	Pushpa Lakshman Gayakwad, Lila Lakshman Gayakwad, Hemant Lakshman Gayakwad, Jayesh Lakshman Gayakwad, Punam Lakshman Gayakwad, Mohini Lakshman Gayakwad	Class I	(33/0)	Vichumb e	119	1,850	156	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 156 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
154	Krushna Dharma Bhingarkar, Vasudev Dharma Bhingarkar	Class II	(39/2)	Vichumb e	129	510	159	They submitted their representation on 26/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final 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. 159, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
155	Shashikala Pai, Arun Changa Surate, Jaydas Changa Surate, Arjun Changa Surate, Deubai Changa Surate,	Class I	(39/1A)	Vichumb e	127	4,750	161	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 161A has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
156	Shankar E. Maitri	Class I	(39/1B)	Vichumb e	128	2,000			
157	Balaram Babu Dundrekar	Class II	(41/0)	Vichumb e	133	2,910	163	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 163, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
158	Digambar Kashinath Gavhane, Mustafa Abbas Sheikh	Class I	(43/2)	Vichumb e	137	430	165	They submitted their representation on 10/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
159	Digambar Kashinath Gavhane, Mustafa Abbas Sheikh	Class I	(43/1/1)	Vichumb e	135	2,090			
160	Mohammad Hanif Sheikh, Alfa Nazir Khatib, Mudassar Nazir Khatib, Nurjaha Nazir Khatib, Rafat Nazir Khatib	Class I	(43/1/2)	Vichumb e	136	1,800	166	They 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.
161	Baliram Dattatreya Patil, Sunil dukalya Patil Sushma Kirane, Surekha Dandekar	Class I	(235/0)	Vichumb e	284	860	167	They submitted their representation on 02/08/2023 but did not appear for a hearing.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								<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 regarding the inclusion of them in the said scheme.</p>	<p>MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme.</p> <p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 167A has been allotted with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.</p>
162	Ramesh Narayan Patil, Barasu Kana Patil, Manda Pandharinath Patil, Ratan Govind Patil	Class I	(46/1)	Vichumb e	140	2,400	168A	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 168A, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
163	Ramesh Narayan Patil, Barasu Kana Patil, Manda Pandharinath Patil, Ratan Govind Patil	Class II	(49/3A)	Vichumb e	146	5,190	168B	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 168B, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
164	Vishnu G. Bhoir, Hanuman G. Bhoir, Sudam G. Bhoir, Shankar G. Bhoir	Class II	(62/1)	Vichumb e	170	14,260	169	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 169 has been allotted with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
165	Chandar Mahadu Bhingarkar, Krushna Dharma Bhingarkar, Vasudev Dharma Bhingarkar, Paribai Narayan Bhoir, Gunabai Datta Patil, Vithabai Sharad Bhagat	Class II	(39/4)	Vichumb e	131	130	170	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 161B has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
166	Dagadu Hirya Patil, Sitaram H. Patil, Munabai H. Patil, Lilabai D. Mundhkar, Talsa H. Patil	Class I	(31/0)	Vichumb e	117	2,630	171	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 171, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
167	Nityanand J. Jhadhav	Class I	(45/0)	Vichumb e	139	860	172	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 172, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
168	Minnath R. Patil	Class I	(46/2)	Vichumb e	141	1,670	173A	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 173A, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
169	Minnath R. Patil	Class II	(49/3B)	Vichumb e	147	5,180	173B	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 173B, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
170	Madhu Shankar Bhoir, Vitthal Ragho Bhoir, Vishnu Ganapat Bhoir, Changunabai Janu Bhoir, Chandrakant Janu Bhoir, Ragho Janu Bhoir, Namdev Janu Bhoir, Taibai Kamlakar Patil, Mandabai Suresh Mundkar	Class I	(56/0)	Vichumb e	163	600	175	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 175, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
171	Padu H. Bhopi, Navdeo T. Bhopi, Jayvanti R. Bhopi, Suresh R. Bhopi, Bharti R. Bhopi, Jitendra R. Bhopi, Reshma Bhopi, Kanha C. Patil, Jayendra C. Patil, Suman Subhash Patil, Pritesh S. Patil, Vikas S. Patil, Ranjana S. Patil, Varun S. Patil, Nayan S. Patil	Class II	(109/2)	Vichumb e	231	2,190	176	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to the change in the name of the owners as per the updated 7/12 extract. 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.
172	M/s. J D Riyalitors Trafe Viki Shyamlal Athorwani	Class I	(109/1)	Vichumb e	230	1,600	177	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 177 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with corrections in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
173	Barasubai Damu Bhoir, Shantabai Vasant Naik, Bali Nama Bhoir, Mainabai Narayan Bhoir, Pralhad Narayam Bhoir, Vishwanath Narayan Bhoir, Sheela Rajendra Bhopi, Manisha Jagdish Bhopi, Priyanka Narayan Bhoir, Babibai Bandu Bhoir, Uttam Bandu Bhoir, Pandurang Bandu Bhoir, Rukmini Arun Bhoir, Sadhna Arun Bhoir, Avinash Arun Bhoir, Sunil Bandu Bhoir, Rekha Changdev Govari, Subhash Ganpat Bhagat, Lilabai Balaram Bhagat, Hirabai Shalik Gavand, Chandrabai Krushna Patil, Bayov Sitaram Bhoir, Pradip Sitaram Bhoir, Sandip Sitaram Bhoir, Yogita Sitaram Bhoir	Class I	(108/1)	Vichumb e	228	2,070	179	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
174	Vilas A. Shedge	Class I	(108/2)	Vichumb e	229	2,200	180	They neither appeared for hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to the change in the name of the owners as per the updated 7/12 extract. 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.
175	Dipak V. Shinde	Class I	(54/1B)	Vichumb e	153	1,530	182	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised


Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
176	Yakub Beg Trust Panvel, Yusufkhan A. Khan, Imran S. Khan, Allabaksha A. Mulla, M. Tasalim M. Husen	Class I	(93/0)	Vichumb e	207	3,570	190	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	reconstituted Final Plot no. 182 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
177	Yakub Beg Trust Panvel, Yusufkhan A. Khan, Imran S. Khan, Allabaksha A. Mulla, M. Tasalim M. Husen	Class I	(106/0)	Vichumb e	226	4,430			The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners as per the updated 7/12 extract.
178	Bijesh Hanumant Bhoir	Class I	(105/1)	Vichumb e	225	3,160	191	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	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.
179	Nilesh Becharbhai Patel	Class I	(62/2)	Vichumb e	171	14,970	192	They appeared for a hearing on 31/07/2023. Submission in hearing - 1) They agreed to the location and shape of the proposed final plot no. 192. 2) They 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. 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 sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
180	Vasant Namdev Bhoir, Anant Namdev Bhoir, Hirubai Baliram Bhagat, Gangabai Dashrath Patil, Janabai Parshuram Patil, Kamlabai Anant Gondhali, Gulab Yashvant Bhoir	Class I	(54/1A)	Vichumb e	152	4,050	193	United Builders submitted their representation on 21/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) They stated that original land bearing survey no 54/1/A, Vichumbe has been taken by them for development. 2) Final plot no 193 is not acceptable to them because the structures are existing on said land. 3.) The decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 4) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 5) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR	Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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. 192, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
									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.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7	
181	Ritesh Raju Patil, Raju Dhanraj Patil	Class I	(101/0)	Vichumb e	218	600	194	They 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.
182	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/1)	Usarli Khurd	531	500	196	They 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.
183	Ganpat Z. Mhatre, Anant Z. Mhatre, Shankuntala Z. Mhatre, Pushpa Urfa Phusabai D. Dharnekar, Vinod Shantaram Patil, Baliram S. Mhatre, Tukaram S. Mhatre, Gangabai Maya Patil, Sitabai S. Mhatre	Class I	(100/1)	Vichumb e	216	580	197	They submitted their representation on 31/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot of remaining 40% of land to them and levy of contribution amount is not acceptable. 2) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. 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.
184	Mahendra Khayalilal Jain, Shital Jitesh Munot	Class I	(100/2)	Vichumb e	217	890	198	They neither appeared for hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 198A has been allotted with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in table B.
185	M/s Unmesh House Makers tarfe Owner Laxmikant Ramkrushn Venkatraman	Class I	(166(P)/1(P))	Usarli khurd	570	11,252	200	They appeared for a hearing on 31/07/2023. Submission in hearing - 1) They have stated that in the plan shown during the owners' meeting by NAINA, Final plot no 202 was allotted to them for their original property bearing survey nos 166/1,2, and 3, and FP no 203 was allotted to Mr. Anil Krishna Patil of survey no 134/1. Now in the Sanctioned Draft Scheme, surveys no 166/1, 2 and 3, and 134/1 are combined and Final plot no 200 has been	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, 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 the applicant's request, separate final plot no. 200A has been allotted for Gut No. 166/1, 2, 3 (all
186	M/s Unmesh House Makers tarfe Owner Laxmikant Ramkrushn Venkatraman	Class I	(166(P)/2(P))	Usarli khurd	571	-			




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
187	M/s Unmesh House Makers tarfe Owner Laxmikant Ramkrushn Venkatraman	Class I	(166(P)/3(P))	Usarli khurd	572	-		proposed. Therefore they requested to grant separate rectangular-shaped final plots for their land bearing survey no 166/1, 2, and 3 on a 45 m wide road. 2) Additionally they have stated that out of their total property (Area 12460 sqm), 2708 sqm area was excluded from the TPS-7 and it is not useful for development. Therefore they requested to consider a total land of 12460 sqm. For allotment of the final plot. 3) They requested to grant a final plot of 60% of their original holding and to grant 2.5 FSI on the final plot. 4) Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions, shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. 5) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 6) 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.	pts) and Final Plot No. 200B has been allotted for Gut No. 134/1. Their 2708 sq. mt area is out of the scheme and therefore cannot be considered for allotment of the Final Plot. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 200A & 200B have been allotted in part of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
188	Anil Krushna Patil	Class I	(134(P)/1(P))	Usarli Khurd	499	-			
189	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/12)	Usarli Khurd	542	500	203	Chairman & Secretary, Vaigyanik Niwas Sahakari Sanstha Maryadit, appeared for a hearing on 31/07/2023. Submission in hearing:- Sub-Divisional Officer, Panvel, wide order dated 15/02/1992 had sanctioned layout and NA permission in their land bearing Survey no. 130/1A, 1B, 137/1, 2, adm. 34,430 sq. mt. The said NA order, NA measurement plan no. 34-18/11/93 and 7/12 extract were submitted. 2. Fresh measurements of their land will be carried out through their architect and will be submitted soon. 3.) Accordingly requested to keep the area and shape of all their 37 plots intact. 4.) Proposed final plots under open spaces and roads are shown in ownership of CIDCO, the society requested to show all plots under the ownership of the society. Ramchandra Bhagat wide representation dated 01.08.2023 submitted that regarding the said lands, various suits are pending in different courts. However any decisions in this regard are not submitted.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 203 to 237 have been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
190	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/11)	Usarli Khurd	541	500	204		
191	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/10)	Usarli Khurd	540	500	205		
192	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/9)	Usarli Khurd	539	500	206		
193	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/8)	Usarli Khurd	538	201	207		
194	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/7)	Usarli Khurd	537	514	208		
195	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/6)	Usarli Khurd	535	500	209		
196	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/13)	Usarli Khurd	543	500	211		
197	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/14)	Usarli Khurd	544	401	212		
198	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/15)	Usarli Khurd	545	513	213		
199	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/17)	Usarli Khurd	547	500	215		



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7		Decision of Arbitrator	
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	7		8	
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6				
200	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/16)	Usarli Khurd	546	500	216				
201	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/18)	Usarli Khurd	548	500	217				
202	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/19)	Usarli Khurd	549	500	218				
203	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/20)	Usarli Khurd	550	500	219				
204	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/21)	Usarli Khurd	551	500	220				
205	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/24)	Usarli Khurd	554	500	221				
206	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/23)	Usarli Khurd	553	401	222				
207	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/22)	Usarli Khurd	552	496	223				
208	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/25)	Usarli Khurd	555	500	224				
209	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/26)	Usarli Khurd	556	500	225				
210	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/27)	Usarli Khurd	557	500	226				
211	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/29)	Usarli Khurd	559	500	227				
212	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/28)	Usarli Khurd	558	500	228				
213	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/30)	Usarli Khurd	560	500	229				
214	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/31)	Usarli Khurd	561	500	230				
215	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/32)	Usarli Khurd	562	500	231				
216	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/33)	Usarli Khurd	563	500	232				
217	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/37)	Usarli Khurd	567	500	234				
218	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/36)	Usarli Khurd	566	522	235				



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
219	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/35)	Usarli Khurd	565	500	236		
220	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/34)	Usarli Khurd	564	501	237		
221	Rajesh keshav Bhavsar, Sandip Pandharinath Kokare	Class I	(129/1)	Usarli Khurd	497	540	238	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 238 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
222	Vandana Mahendra Bhavsar, Sanjay Vasasnt Mahtre	Class I	(129/2)	Usarli Khurd	498	3,000			
223	Ram C Chikhlekar, Lakshman C Chikhlekar, Sambhaji C Chikhlekar, Pandurang C Chikhlekar, Sangeeta D Mhaskar, Geeta M Ulvekar, Prema D Gharat	Class II	(30/3)	Usarli Khurd	366	590	240	They neither appeared for hearing not submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 240 has been allotted with corrections in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
224	M/s Mahavir Builders Through partner Shailesh Mathur, Vinay B Patil	Class I	(138/1)	Usarli Khurd	502	4,120	244	<p>Adv. Ashok Joshi, on behalf of M/s F K Construction, Partners Shri. Subhash Yadav submitted a representation dated 25.07.2023. Therefore joint hearing was conducted on 29.08.2023 & 08.09.2023. Their submissions during the hearing and in representations are as follows:</p> <p>M/s F K Construction-</p> <p>1. They filed SCS 92/1996 against the proposed allottee, Partners of M/s Mahavir Builders, before CJSD, Panvel regarding the original lands bearing S.no. 138/1 & 138/2, village Usarli khurd. The said suit was decreed by the Hon. court by judgment dated 21.07.2012.</p> <p>2. Shri. Vijay Patil and Shailendra Mathur, Partners Mahavir Builders filed an appeal against the said judgment in the Mumbai High Court and now the said Civil Appeal no. 580/2019 is pending for hearing before District Court, Raigad.</p> <p>3. The decree ordered to execute the sale deed in favor of M/s F K Construction and it was declared that the sale deeds dated 14.09.95 & 10.11.95 of the suit land are null and void.</p> <p>4. Accordingly stated that the proposed allotment of FP no. 244 to M/s Mahavir Builder through partners Shailendra Mathur & Vinay Patil is wrong and illegal and requested to stay the hearing of Final plot no. 244 until the final</p>	<p>1. Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the MR & TP Act, 1966 provisions.</p> <p>2. As per Section 71 of the MR & TP Act, if a civil court passes any decree 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 have been suitably corrected/varied because of such decree.</p> <p>3. In this case, M/s F K Construction had filed SCS 92/1996 against the proposed allottee of the final plot, Partners of M/s Mahavir Builders, before CJSD, Panvel regarding the original lands bearing S.no. 138/1 & 138/2, village Usarli khurd. The said suit was decreed by the Hon. court by judgment dated 21.07.2012. It was ordered that the defendant be permanently restrained from causing any obstruction in peaceful possession of the plaintiff and declared that the sale deeds dated 14.09.95 & 10.11.95 of the suit lands are null and void. M/s Mahavir Builders had challenged the judgment before the High Court of Judicature at Bombay by filing the first Appeal no. 1235/2012. Hon. High Court, vide order dated 25.04.2013 directed that pending hearing and final disposal of the present First Appeal, the execution, operation, and implementation of the judgment and Decree dated</p>
225	M/s Mahavir Builders Through partner Shailesh Mathur, Vinay B Patil	Class I	(138/2)	Usarli Khurd	503	4,000			



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								<p>decision in Regular Civil Appeal no. 580/2019.</p> <p>Adv. Amay Sawlekar on behalf of their client, M/s Mahavir Builder through partners Shailendra Mathur & Vinay Patil, submitted the reply dated 04.10.2023</p> <p>1. They are the exclusive owner of Survey no. 138/1 & 138/2 at village Usarli-Khurd, Panvel.</p> <p>2. They have purchased the said properties by two registered sale deeds dated 14.09.95 & 10.11.95.</p> <p>3. They challenged the judgment of CJSD, Panvel dated 21.07.2012 and Hon. High Court at Mumbai granted status quo and interim relief against the said judgment by order dated 05.09.2012 & 25.04.2013. The said order of the High Court is still in existence.</p> <p>4. As per the provisions laid down in order 41, Rule 5 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908, the pendency of the Appeal shall not operate as a stay of proceeding. Therefore there is no need to stay the proceeding until the decision of RCA 580/2019 pending before the Hon. Additional District Court, Panvel.</p>	<p>21.07.2012 passed by the Jt. Civil Judge, Panvel in SCS 92/1996 be stayed. Now the matter is pending before the Additional District Judge Raigad at Panvel under Regular Civil Appeal No. 580/2019.</p> <p>Thus the claims of M/s F K Construction in the said original lands are already subjudged. Therefore the ownership of the final plot is maintained as per 7/12 extract of the original lands subject to the decision in the Regular Civil Appeal no. 580/2019 in the District Court, Panvel.</p> <p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 244 has been allotted at the location of their original plot with corrections in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.</p>
226	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/5)	Usarli Khurd	535	485	246	Chairman & Secretary, Vaignyanik Niwas Sahakari Sanstha Maryadit, appeared for hearing on 31/07/2023.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 246 to 249 have been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
227	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/4)	Usarli Khurd	534	500	247	Submission in hearing:- Sub-Divisional Officer, Panvel, wide order dated 15/02/1992 had sanctioned layout and NA permission in their land bearing Survey no. 130/1A, 1B, 137/1, 2, adm. 34,430 sq.mt. The said NA order, NA measurement plan no. 34-18/11/93 and 7/12 extract were submitted. 2. Fresh measurement of their land will be carried out through their architect and will be submitted soon. 3.) Accordingly requested to to keep the area and shape of all their 37 plots intact. 4.) Proposed final plots under open spaces and roads are shown in ownership of CIDCO. Society Requested is to show all plots under the ownership of the society.	
228	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/3)	Usarli Khurd	533	500	248		
229	Vaignyanik Niwas Sarkari Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(165/2)	Usarli Khurd	532	500	249		
230	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(94/1)	Vichumb e	208	230	250	Moraya Garden Residency CHS has submitted representation dated 04.08.2023 and objected to allotting the Final plot to the previous owners.	1. Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
231	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(94/2B)	Vichumb e	210	720	<p>Therefore joint hearings were conducted on 29.08.2023 and 06.10.2023. Their submission during the hearing and in representations are as follows:</p> <p>M/s Moraya Garden Residency CHS-</p> <p>1. Collector, Raigad granted development permission dated 31.05.2011 for joint development of lands bearings Gut Nos. 31/1-2, 32, 33, 34/2, 35, 37, 38 of village Usarli Khurd and Gut nos. 94/1-2B-2C, 95, 96, 97/1-2, 98pt, 99, 102/1-2-3, 103, 105/2, 107, 236 of village Vichumbe, totally admeasuring 36,600 sq. mt. (hereinafter referred to as "the said lands")The land was in a U-2 zone and with a total permissible FSI of 0.406, 5 buildings were approved.</p> <p>2. Earlier plot owner's society, namely Garden Residency CHS Ltd. Promoter Xavier Pawath, originally purchased the said lands.</p> <p>3. By registered development agreement cum conveyance dated 06.06.2011, the said society had conveyed all their rights to M/s Nirvana Developers. The said developer constructed 5 buildings and entered into registered agreements for the sale of flats including a proportionate share in the common properties consisting of all the above-mentioned lands. Thus the flat purchasers become co-owners of this entire property.</p> <p>4. More than 68% of flat owners formed this society as per an order dated 09.02.2017 passed by the Competent Authority and District Dy. Registrar of Co-Op societies at Alibaug.</p> <p>5. Accordingly they prayed to exclude above mentioned lands in Vichumbe from TPS-7 and no allotment of alternative plot should be given to the said plot owners Garden Residency CHS.</p> <p>Smt. Shashikala Pai-</p> <p>1. The scheme defies basic sense to take away 60% of a person's land and compensate them only in terms of development rights on the remaining land.</p> <p>2. She was the erstwhile owner of the said lands. Her brother, Mr. Gajanan Desai had obtained a POA dated 27.03.1997 from her for dealing with</p>	2. 'The Collector, Raigad granted revised layout cum building permission dated 31.05.2011 for joint development and group housing in lands bearings Gut Nos. 31/1-2, 32, 33, 34/2, 35, 37, 38 of village Usarli Khurd and Gut nos. 94/1-2B-2C, 95, 96, 97/1-2, 98pt, 99, 102/1-2-3, 103, 105/2, 107, 236 of village Vichumbe, totally admeasuring 36,600 sq. mt. Mumbai-Badodara 90 mt. wide highway was proposed through the said land. The said road was considered as the arterial road and by transferring the area of 5550 sq. mt. under the said road, free of cost to the planning authority, FSI up to the extent of the total 0.406 was sanctioned under Regulation no. 15.5.4.3. Therefore in the draft scheme, the area under the said road has been deducted from the total area. It was stipulated that subdivision of land in the layout is not permissible without prior permission. However, in the draft scheme, the part area under the said permission i.e. Gut nos. 94/1-2B-2C, 95, 96, 98, 99, 102/1-2-3, 103/0, 105/2, and 107 of village Vichumbe were included, and the remaining area in which the maximum permissible FSI of the entire scheme consumed, was kept outside of the scheme. This will create an imbalance in the FSI of the sanctioned development permission. As per updated 7/12 extract, the area of the owner in Gut no 98 is 1050 sqm. and the total area under TPS-7 is 15590 sqm. <p>As per the provisions of the said Act, an additional area can be included in the scheme only before submission of the draft scheme to the state Govt. Therefore it is directed that the said final plot shall not be independently considered for development but shall be considered for joint development with the remaining lands under the above-sanctioned development permission.</p>	
232	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(94/2C)	Vichumb e	211	400			
233	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(95/0)	Vichumb e	212	4,270			
234	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(96/0)	Vichumb e	213	940			
235	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(99/0)	Vichumb e	215	2,860			
236	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(102/1)	Vichumb e	219	960			
237	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(102/2)	Vichumb e	220	350			
238	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(102/3)	Vichumb e	221	710			
239	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(103/1)	Vichumb e	222	700			
240	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(105/2)	Vichumb e	224	910			
241	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(107/0)	Vichumb e	227	1,490			
242	M/s Garden Residency Co. Sco. Chief Promotor Zavior Tonny Pavath	Class I	(98/0)	Vichumb e	214	2,050		<p>3. As per Section 71 of the MR & TP Act, if</p>	



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								<p>the said lands, without paying any monetary consideration to her.</p> <p>2. In the said POA, there was a restrictive covenant that she would have an exclusive right to amalgamate any of her adjoining properties with the said lands whereby she alone will be entitled to utilize on such surrounding properties all or any FSI area of the said lands, exceeding over and above 2, 07,000 sq. ft. under DCR in force from time to time.</p> <p>3. Based on the POA, her brother executed separate sale deeds for transferring the said lands in favor of Xavier Tony Pawath who has been described as the chief promoter of the Garden Residency CHSL.</p> <p>4. She has filed special Civil Suit no. 423/2011 before the CJSD, Panvel, which is pending. In the proceedings arising from the suit, Hon. High Court has passed the order dated 12.10.2011 thereby directing that the third-party rights created by the said Xavier Tony Pawath and any development carried out by him would be subject to the outcome of the said suit.</p> <p>5. Requested to notify her rights as part of the scheme, so that she would be able to utilize the FSI and other rights over the said lands over and above 2,07,000 sq.ft.on her adjoining properties.</p> <p>M/s Garden Residency CHS Ltd.</p> <p>1. The society accepts the offer made by CIDCO for NAINA project-7 and grants consent to receive land as per the scheme.</p> <p>2. Regarding M/s Moraya Garden Residency CHS says, it was submitted that right from the time of registration till date, their society has been classified as a "tenant co-parceners" society, and therefore the formation of a new society is bad in law.</p> <p>3. There is already a pending proceeding before the Hon. High Court against Moraya Garden CHS Ltd.</p> <p>4. Regarding the say of Ms. Shashikala Pai, it was submitted that she has suppressed the MOU dated 02/05.1995, whereunder she had given up all her rights, and titles in the said property to M/s Sundanan Developers. The order of the</p>	<p>a civil court passes any decree 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 have been suitably corrected/varied because of such decree.</p> <p>In this case, Smt. Shashikala Pai instituted a Special Suit no. 423/2011 in the court of Civil Judge, Sr. Dvn Panvel. In Civil Application no.1325/2011 in Appeal from order no. 992/2011, Hon. High Court of Judicature at Bombay passed an order dt. 12.10.2011. It was ordered that since the matter is subjudiced and the entitlement of the plaintiff is yet to be determined, whatever third-party interest created by defendant no 3 (Gajanan Desai) and whatever development that would be carried out by defendants no. 1 &2 (Garden Residency CHSL) would be subject to the final outcome of the proceeding i.e. Special Civil Suit no.423/2011 and the instant appeal from the order.</p> <p>Thus the claims of Smt. Shashikala Pai in the said original lands are already subjudiced and the fact that only the part area of the land in the sanctioned permission has been included in the scheme. Also, Moraya Garden Residency CHSL has not done the conveyance of the said land in their favor.</p> <p>4. Therefore the ownership of the final plot is maintained as per the 7/12 extract of the original lands subject to the final decision in the Special Civil Suit no. 423/2011 in the Court of Civil Judge, Sr. Dn, Panvel.</p> <p>5. The layout of the scheme has been revised from planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 250A has been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.</p>

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								Hon. High Court clearly states that she can only claim benefits from her brother, Mr. Gajanan Desai, the POA holder.	6. For the original land bearing Gut no 98(pt) adm. 1000 sqm. , in the name of Mr/. Sudam Ganpat Bhoir, Final plot no 250C has been allotted as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
243	Shashikala Pai, Alaukik Pai	Class I	(135(P)/0)	Usarli Khurd	500	3,275	251	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted their representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 251, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
244	Prabhakar Raghunath Bhoir, Purushottam Baban Bhoir	Class I	(48/0)	Vichumb e	143	1,370	252A	They submitted their representation on 31/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allotment of remaining 40% of land to them and levy of contribution amount is not acceptable. 2) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 252A, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
245	Prabhakar Raghunath Bhoir, Purushottam Baban Bhoir	Class II	(49/1)	Vichumb e	144	2,500	252B	They submitted their representation on 31/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allotment of remaining 40% of land to them and levy of contribution amount is not acceptable. 2) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 252B, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
246	Ramdas Kathod Bhoir, Dattatray Kathod Bhoir, Laxmibai Kathod Bhoir, Nami Harichanra Bhoir	Class I	(104/0)	Vichumb e	223	2,380	253B	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted their representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 253B, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
247	Ramdas Kathod Bhoir, Dattatray Kathod Bhoir, Laxmibai Kathod Bhoir, Nami Harichanra Bhoir	Class I	(237/0)	Vichumb e	285	3,840			
248	Ramdas Kathod Bhoir, Dattatray Kathod Bhoir, Laxmibai Kathod Bhoir, Nami Harichanra Bhoir	Class II	(215/1)	Vichumb e	274	2,330	253A	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 253A, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
249	Bapu R. Bhoir, Dinesh N. Bhagat	Class I	(28/0)	Vichumb e	114	4,810	254	Dinesh Bhagat submitted their representation on 02/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation-) Their written consent was not taken to include their land in NAINA TPS. 2.) As per TPS-7, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allotment of the remaining 40% of land to them and levy of contribution amount is not acceptable 3) In survey no 28- Area 4810 sq.mt., the applicant owns 1600 sqm. and the remaining 3210 sqm. is under the ownership of Kamli Bapu Bhoir & another 6, however, the applicant's holding in proposed final plot no 254 is not mentioned in the notice.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final 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. 254, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
250	Rajesh Y. Mhatre, Jayesh Y. Mhatre, Nilesh Y. Mhatre	Class I	(94/2A)	Vichumb e	209	320	255	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 255, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
251	Kishor Shivdas Govari	Class I	(234/0)	Vichumb e	283	1,060	257	They 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. 257, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
252	Jyotsna J. Patil	Class I	(46/1/2)	Usarli Khurd	378	4,050	259	Smt Jotsna Patil submitted their representation. Submission in hearing -1.) There is existing structure in the part area of allotted final plot no. 259 and therefore requested to demolish the structure before granting the plot or to allot different final plot. 2) They requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land with 3.00 FSI. 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.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 259 have been allotted with corrections in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
253	Shashikala Pai	Class I	(30/1)	Usarli Khurd	364	1,970	261	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
254	Shashikala Pai	Class I	(30/2)	Usarli Khurd	365	730			
255	Shashikala Pai	Class I	(91/0)	Vichumb e	205	3,290			



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
256	Rajendra Venketesh Pai, Vikramaditya V Pai, Shirish Pai	Class II	(47/1)	Usarli Khurd	379	10,460	262	<p>They appeared for a hearing on 08/08/2023 and also submitted their representation on 03/08/2023.</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 75% 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>Submission from Shri. Vinod Vitthal Bhoir dated 25/08/2023- 1) Smt. Shakuntala V. Bhoir and 3 others have submitted a tenancy appeal in the court of Sub-divisional Officer, Panvel, under section 74 of Mumbai Tenancy and Agriculture Land Act 1974, against the order of Addl. Tahsildar, Panvel dated 29/11/1969. The said appeal is on admission and a regular hearing has been started since 18/05/2023. Accordingly, the applicant has submitted an objection to take any decision regarding the finalization of Final Plot no 262, until the final decision of the said appeal.</p>	<p>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 75% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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>As there is no order in tenancy appeal in the court of Sub-divisional Officer, Panvel, the ownership of the final plot is maintained as per the 7/12 extract of the original lands</p> <p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 262, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
257	Madhukar D. Bhagat	Class I	(47/2)	Usarli Khurd	380	2,010	263	<p>They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.</p>	<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in the name of the owners as per the updated 7/12 extract.</p> <p>Final Plot No. 263, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>
258	Ganpat S. Bhagat	Class II	(49/0)	Usarli Khurd	382	400	264	<p>They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.</p>	<p>The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 264 has been allotted with correction in the area and ownership as shown in the plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.</p>
259	Raje Shiwaji sankul sahkari gruhnirman sanstha	Class I	(53/1)	Usarli Khurd	384	1,391	270	<p>Shri. Sanjay G Patkar attended the hearing and submitted the representation on 08/08/2023.</p>	<p>1. The Collector, Raigad, vide order dated 16.02.2010, granted revised building permission for</p>




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
260	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(53/2)	Usarli Khurd	385	718		<p>Submission in the hearing and representation- 1) Their land bearing survey no 53/1, 2, 3, 45/3/1, 2, 3, 4, 45/4/1, 2, 3, 19/1A/1 to 8 adm. 24620 sqm. is a NA plot for which NA permission and approved building plans were received on 16/02/2010 from Collector Raigad. The proposal was comprised of group housing on 2 plots and bungalow plots on the rest of the area, the group housing was completed and buildings were occupied. The residents of buildings no 1, 2, and 3 formed a society, and conveyance was obtained. Also, conveyance was obtained for building no 4 as a separate society. 2) The balance area after deducting land in the ownership of the said societies is 18615 sqm. (24620-6005) and 40% of this works out to 7446 sqm. Their second plot bearing survey no 63/1/2 measures 8000 sqm. and its final plot of 40% works out to 3200 sqm. Thus their total final plot area for original plots works out to 10646 sqm. 3) They have submitted 3 options for the said final plot and if they are not found suitable, then their final plot shall be located on a 20 m wide road as a single plot.</p>	<p>a group housing scheme in lands bearing Gut 19/1A, 45/3-4, 53, totally measuring 24,620 sq. mt. 2. The residents of building no. 1, 2 & 3 formed a society, and building no. 4 formed another society and both the societies obtained conveyance of land under them. The land under the societies, bearing Gut no. 19/1A/6, 19/1A/7 & 53/1, is 6005 sq.mt. 3. The applicant has requested that after deducting the society land, their remaining area in the sanctioned housing scheme is 18615 sq. mt and by adding another plot bearing 63/1/2, 8000 sq. mt, their total land measures 26615 sq. mt and against it, a single final plot of 10,646 sq. mt (40%) shall be granted on 20 mt. wide road. In addition, the plot under the societies is 6005 sq. mt. 4. It is the joint development permission, wherein all the gut nos are clubbed together and the permissible FSI of the entire land was sanctioned throughout the scheme. Condition no 9 of the permission specifies that the lands in the layout cannot be subdivided without prior permission. However, in the sanctioned Draft Scheme, 23,820 sq. mt land has been included and the remaining area (Gut no. 45/3/2-800 sq.mt) is out of the scheme. 5. In preparation for TPS, CIDCO has adopted the principle to protect the existing structure by giving FP around it. Also, it was informed that a final plot of a minimum of 40% to not exceeding 100% OP area may be carved out considering the presence of structure, and available access. Accordingly, the final plots are proposed in the sanctioned draft scheme no.6. However in this case, irrespective of sanctioned permission and separation of 7/12 extracts for the societies developed therein, the final plot to the tune of 40% of the original lands was proposed in the sanctioned draft scheme. 7. Therefore by considering the sanctioned permission and existing development therein, 100% area for the land under society measuring. 6005 sq. mt. and 40% for the remaining area measuring 7126 sq. mt, the total area of 13131 sq. mt has been granted as the final plot against all the original lands. 8. The layout of the scheme has been revised from planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 270 has been allotted at</p>
261	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(53/3)	Usarli Khurd	386	591			
262	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(45/3/1)	Usarli Khurd	367	3,268			
263	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(45/3/2)	Usarli Khurd	368	2,309			
264	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(45/3/3)	Usarli Khurd	369	197			
265	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(45/3/4)	Usarli Khurd	370	2,309			
266	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(45(P)/4/1(P))	Usarli Khurd	372	4,896			
267	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(45(P)/4/2(P))	Usarli Khurd	373	-			
268	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(45(P)/4/3(P))	Usarli Khurd	374	-			
269	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(19/1A/1)	Usarli Khurd	342	100			
270	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(19/1A/2)	Usarli Khurd	343	114			
271	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(19/1A/3)	Usarli Khurd	344	1,668			
272	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(19/1A/4)	Usarli Khurd	345	1,235			
273	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(19/1A/5)	Usarli Khurd	346	3,095			
274	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(19/1A/6)	Usarli Khurd	347	2,287			
275	Raje Shiwaji sankul sahkari gruhnirman sanstha	Class I	(19/1A/7)	Usarli Khurd	348	2,327			
276	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(19/1A/8)	Usarli Khurd	349	2,506			

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
277	M/s Tirupati Balaji Buildcon Pvt Ltd. Director through Partners Mahendra P Singh, Janardhan L Kharude, Sudhir B Todkar, M/s Prayag Builders and Developers, Pradeep K Bhopi	Class I	(46/1/1)	Usarli Khurd	375	5,760	267		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.
278	M/s Tirupati Balaji Buildcon Pvt Ltd. Director through Partners Mahendra P Singh, Janardhan L Kharude, Sudhir B Todkar	Class I	(46/2)	Usarli Khurd	376	2,030			
279	M/s Tirupati Balaji Buildcon Pvt Ltd. Director through Partners Mahendra P Singh, Janardhan L Kharude, Sudhir B Todkar	Class I	(46/3)	Usarli Khurd	377	2,020			
280	Sunil D Sonavle, Baliram D Patil	Class I	(45/2)	Usarli Khurd	371	3,440	268	They submitted their representation on 02/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them and levy of contribution amount is not acceptable. 2) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. As per the updated 7/12 extract, the proposed Final Plot No. 268 has been divided into 268A for Gut no 45/2/A and Final Plot no 268B for Gut No. 45/2/B. Accordingly, revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 268A & 268B have been allotted at the location of part of their original land with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
281	Ramdas K. Bhoir, Dattatray K Bhoir, Sarita H Bhoir, Lakshmibai K Bhoir, Kamlabai D Bhoir	Class I	(50(P)/0)	Usarli Khurd	383	192	271	They submitted their representation on 03/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation - 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. 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.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								acquired under the LARR Act. 4) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7	
282	Padu Hari Bhopi, Namdev Tukaram Bhopi, Gomi tukaram Bhopi, Jayavanti Ramdas Bhopi, Suresh Ramdas Bhopi. Bharati Ramdas Bhopi, jitendra Ramdas Bhopi, Reshma Ramdas Bhopi, Kanha Chandrakant Patil, Jayendra Chandrakant Patil, Suman Subhash Patil, Pritesh Subhash Patil, Vikas Subhash Patil, Ranjana Santosh Patil, Varun Santosh Patil, Nayan Santosh Patil	Class I	(24(P)/0)	Vichumb e	109	741	272	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per the updated 7/12 extract, the total area of the owners is 2510 sqm. Out of which 1388 sqm. area has been included in TP Scheme no 5. Accordingly, the area of Gat no 24 (p) in the said scheme is 1122 sqm. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 198B has been allotted with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in table B
283	Shree Shankar Devsthan vichumbe, Keshav Kana Bhingarkar, Gangabai Chahu Bhingarkar, Vijay Chahu Bhingarkar, Vishawas Chahu Bhingarkar, Kalibai chandrakant Patil, Sakharibai chandrakant Govari, Kundabai Suresh Bhingarkar, Rajesh Suresh Bhingarkar, Amita Vishawas Govari, Sangita Patil, Sudhir Janardan Keni, Prasad Rajendra Keni, Anil Janardan Keni, Aruna Rajendra Keni, Shobha Janardan Keni, Maribai Rajendra Keni	Class I	(125(P)/2/1(P))	Vichumb e	238	1,360	274	Shahanvaj Alam & Immamuddin Shaikh appeared for hearing on 03/08/2023. 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-7, 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-7. 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.
284	M/s I. M. S. Tarfe Mohmmad Mumtaj Abadul Kayak, Shahanvaj Kamrulhoda Alam, Mohmmad emamuddin Mohmmad Amarulah shaikh, Sanjay K. J. Shinh	Class I	(125(P)/1/1(P))	Vichumb e	236	-			As per the updated 7/12 extract and the ownership, Final Plot no. 274 in the sanctioned draft scheme is subdivided, and Final Plot no. 274A has been allotted for Gut no. 125/2 and Final Plot no. 274B has been allotted for Gut no. 125/1/1 and 125/1/2.
285	M/s I. M. S. Tarfe Mohmmad Mumtaj Abadul Kayak, Shahanvaj Kamrulhoda Alam, Mohmmad mamuddin Mohmmad Amarulah shaikha, Sanjay K. J. Shinh	Class I	(125(P)/1/2(P))	Vichumb e	237	-			The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 274A & 274B have been allotted at the location of their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
286	Bapu R. Bhoir, Harichandra P. Bhoir, Babibai K. Bhoir, Hanuman K. Bhoir, Bansidhar K. Bhoir, Gitabai M. Patil, Vanmala N. Pandit, Kunda R. Madhavi, Sulochana C. Keni, Sarita S. Gondhali	Class I	(68/0)	Vichumb e	184	2,810	275	They submitted their representation on 03/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation - 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed,



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								public purpose; including them in the 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-7	subject to change in the name of the 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.
287	Arjun Hasha Patil, Joma Hasha Patil, Babi Damu Patil, Shaila Shaniwar Chimane, Chandra Atmaram Govari, Nanda Bharat Bhingarkar, Ganesh Namdev Patil, Navin Krushna Patil, Satish Krushna Patil, Ramibai (Pramila) Chandrakant Pardeshi	Class I	(57/0)	Vichumb e	164	4,480	276	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
288	Ramesh D. Patel, Govind D Ravriya, Laxman R Patel	Class II	(207(P)/0)	Shivkar	689	12,781	278, 287	They appeared for a hearing on 03-08-2023 Submission in hearing - 1) For their original land bearing survey no.207, two final plots no. 278 and 287 are proposed at different locations and therefore they requested to allot a single corner plot along a 20 m wide road 2) There is an unauthorized structure existing in final plot no. 287. 3) They requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 4.) 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. 5) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived off. 6) 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-7, 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-7. 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 requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 278 & 287 have been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
289	Sadanand D Mhatre, Manoraj D Mhatre	Class II	(119/2)	Usarli Khurd	491	1,060	279A	They submitted their representation on 02/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation - 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them and levy of contribution amount is not acceptable. 2) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	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. 279A, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
290	Sadanand D Mhatre, Manoraj D Mhatre	Class I	(26/0)	Usarli Khurd	362	4,500	279B	They submitted their representation on 02/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation - 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them and levy of contribution amount is not acceptable. 2) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final 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. 279B, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
291	Vinay Vijay Agrawal	Class I	(61/2)	Vichumb e	171	7,460	280	They 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.
292	Harresh H Mhatre, Shridhar H Mhatre, Nanda M Khutarkar, Lahuji Mhatre, Ankush G Mhatre, Bhagwan G Mhatre, Aparna D Kadam, Umesh M Mhatre, Ashirwad M Mhatre, Durga H Mhatre, Ram G Mhatre, Vasant G Mhatre	Class I	(23/0)	Usarli Khurd	358	6,150	281	They submitted their representation on 03/08/2023 but did not appear for a hearing. Submission in representation- 1) They requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	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. 281, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
293	Ravikumar M Arya, Pawan kumar M Arya	Class I	(25/3)	Usarli Khurd	361	5,880	282	They neither appeared for hearing not submitted any representation.	As per the updated 7/12 extract, the area of Gat no 25/3 is 6000 sqm. 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.
294	Ashok D Bhagat, Ramakant D Bhagat, Babibai D Bhagat, Manik A Joshi, Manda M Bhoir, Lata D Bhagat, Sarita S Bhagat, Rajesh S Bhagat, Jyoti L Bhoir, Jyotsna L Bhagat, Meenakshi J Bhagat, Harreshwar V Patil, Pratibha S Bhagat, Priya S Bhoir, Snehal A Patil, Geetanijai H Govari	Class I	(25(P)/2(P))	Usarli Khurd	361	7,736	283	They neither appeared for hearing not submitted any representation.	The part area of the original land bearing Gut No. 25/2 measuring 4272 sq.mt has been included in the scheme. Accordingly, A Final plot of 40% i.e. 1709 sq. mt has been proposed. 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.
295	Nirabai J. Mhatre	Class I	(24/0)	Usarli Khurd	359	4,100	284	They submitted their representation on 02/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them and levy of contribution amount is not	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 284, as shown in plan No. 4, has been



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								acceptable. 2) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
296	Harishchandra Pandu Bhaoir, Bhagwan bhimrao Aaher, Ashish Suresh Jadhav, Dhanraj Urf Dhanavant Ramdas mahajan, Balasaheb Mahadev Savant, Sakharam Tukaram Shende	Class I	(49/2)	Vichumb e	145	5,870	285	They submitted their representation on 10/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
297	Bhagchand C Khubchandani, Maganbhai N Patel, Bhavna B Gadhiya, Posha G Bhoir, Lakhan G Bhoir, Kamini G Bhoir, Ajay G Bhoir, Renuka G Bhoir	Class I	(57/2)	Usarli Khurd	388	3,240	286	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 286 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
298	Vittal Govind Pardeshi	Class I	(19/1C/2)	Usarli Khurd	351	1,700	290	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 290, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
299	Aabasaheb shankar Aldar	Class I	(20/0)	Usarli Khurd	357	1,060	291	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 291 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
300	M/s DSE Enterprises Registered , Partner on Behalf of Association - Shankar Hande, Abdul Wahid, Wamik, Sheikh	Class I	(19/1B/1)	Usarli Khurd	353	2,000	292	They submitted their representation on 04/05/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation - 1) They stated that there are some existing structures on the allotted Final plot no 292 and therefore requested to allot the final plot in their original property bearing no. 19/1B/1 in Usarli Khurd.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 292 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
301	Prakash R. Bhagat	Class I	(19/1B/2)	Usarli Khurd	354	2,020	293	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 293 has been allotted



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
302	Ramesh N. Bhagat	Class I	(19/1C/1/2)	Usarli Khurd	352	2,400	295	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 295 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
303	Nitin Krushna Bhagat	Class I	(19/1C/1/1)	Usarli Khurd	350	3,180	296, 297	They submitted their representation on 04/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation - 1) They stated that their land bearing Gut no 19/1C/1/1, area 3180 sqm. is agricultural land and there is an existing structure bearing Gram Panchayat no 521 2) In TPS, a 12 m wide road is proposed in their land 3) They requested to grant the final plot in their original holding.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 296 has been allotted with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
304	Shashikant K Kalushte, Vaishali V Palkar, Anand K Kalushte, Amruta A Kalushte, Omkar A Kalushte, Rekha N Todkari	Class I	(12/2)	Usarli Khurd	331	300	299	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 299 has been allotted with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
305	Madhukar G Kulkarni, Rajendra G Kulkarni, Neeta Adhikari, Anil G Kulkarni, Aboli A Kulkarni, Vaishali V Kulkarni, Rahul M Kulkarni	Class I	(12/1)	Usarli Khurd	330	2,504			
306	Kishor Shivdas Govari	Class I	(11/2)	Usarli Khurd	329	660	300	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 300, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
307	Parvati N Bhagat, Padmakar K Bhagat, Dhau K Bhagat, Janardhan G Bhagat, Manohar G Bhagat, Shankar Babu (Alias Padu Bhagat), Narayan Babu (Alias Padu Bhagat), Chau Babu (Alias Padu Bhagat), Sanjay B Bhagat, Santosh B Bhagat, Sunanda V Gowari, Bamibai J Bhagat, Gajanan J Bhagat, Ranjana S Bhoir, Vandana P Gondhali, Shanta P Bhoir, Sharda N Bhagat, Ganesh N Bhagat, Rekha K Patil, Hirabai B Bhagat, Kalabai C Gowari, Manda U Patil, Anil B Bhagat, Leela K Patil, Pushpa S Patil, Ajinkya D Bhagat, Aditiya D Bhagat, Ameya D Bhagat, Sudha D Bhagat.	Class II	(11/1)	Usarli Khurd	328	6,020	301	They submitted their representation on 21/08/2023 but did not appeared for hearing. Submission in representation: 1) They requested to grant final plot of minimum 60 % of their original land with 2.5 FSI. Also requested to allot the final plot in the ratio of 2:1 and to apply UDCPR. 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.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final 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. 301, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
308	Shri Dyaneshwar Mauli Co.	Class I	(80/2)	Vichumb e	193	12,010	302	<p>They appeared for a hearing on 04-08-2023 and also submitted their representation.</p> <p>Submission in hearing -1) Since 2007, there have been 428 residential dwelling units and 13 commercial units present on their original property bearing survey no 80/2 adm. 12010 sqm. However, in lieu of the said land, the final plot is proposed at another location. Therefore they requested to allot the Final plot at the original location by considering the existing structures on their land. 2) They requested to allow 4 FSI on their proposed 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>The Collector, Raigad wide order dated Masha /LNA.1 /CR88 /2006 dated 15.12.2006 had granted sanctioned layout cum building permission to Dnyaneshwar Mauli CHS. As per the sanctioned plan from ADTP, Raigad dated 26.07.2006, available in NAINA office, the plotted layout was finally approved and ground storied structure of 26.36 sq. m. was approved in each plot. However, it is seen that Ground + Two Storied structures are existed on the site and the existing development is not as per the sanctioned permission.</p> <p>Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. In the sanctioned development plan of NAINA, original land bearing Gut no. 80 of village Vichumb e is under the reservation of Growth Centre and therefore they have been granted the final plot at another location fronting on 12.0 mt. wide layout road in the sanctioned Draft Scheme.</p> <p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.</p>
309	Vishwas Laxshman Bhagat	Class I	(10/1A/1)	Usarli Khurd	319	1,900	303	<p>They neither appeared for hearing not submitted any representation.</p>	<p>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.</p>
310	Subhas K. Sarpotdar	Class I	(63/1/1)	Usarli Khurd	401	8,100	304	<p>They appeared for a hearing on 08/08/2023.</p> <p>Submission in the representation 1) They requested to allot Final plot no 304 at the property of their agriculture house no 37/1 and 37/2. 2) Also, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) 2.5 FSI 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>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, 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-7. 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. Final Plot No. 304, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.</p>




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
311	Smita Sapre, Swapna Sapre, Ujjwala Sapre, Alpna Annachatre, Prachi prasade, Dipti patil	Class I	(10/1A/2)	Usarli Khurd	320	23,295	305, 310	They appeared for a hearing on 04/08/2023. Submission in hearing - 1) In the TP scheme they have been granted Final plots no 305 and 310 in lieu of their original land bearing survey no 10/1A/2, 19/4A (p), 19/4B, 63/2, 10/2/1. They accepted the location of the final plot, however, they mentioned that survey no 19/4A (p) is not owned by them and they have no relation with the owner of the said land. Also, the area of survey no 19/4B is 5000 sqm. and it is not mentioned in Form -1. Therefore they requested that for their land bearing survey no 10/1A/2, 19/4B, 63/2, and 10/2/1 adm. 48825 sqm, independent Final plot shall be granted.) Also, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) 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-7, 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-7. 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.
312	Shubhangi Nishikant Bhagat, mayuresh Nishikant Bhagat, Juili Nishikant Bhagat, S.No. 2 & 3 a.p.a.k I	Class I	(19(P)/4A(P))	Usarli Khurd	355	5,635			
313	Ujjwala R Sapre, Alpna A Annachatre, Deepti S Patil	Class I	(19(P)/4B(P))	Usarli Khurd	356	-			
314	Smita Sapre, Swapna Sapre, Ujjwala Sapre, Alpna Annachatre, Prachi Prasade, Dipti Patil	Class I	(10/2/1)	Usarli Khurd	322	1,400			
315	Ujjwala R Sapre, Alpna A Annachatre, Deepti S Patil, Prachi N Prasade	Class I	(63/2)	Usarli Khurd	403	19,130	306	They neither appeared for hearing not submitted any representation.	As per the applicant's request, separate final plot no. 305A & 310A have been allotted for Gut No. 10/1A/2 pt, 19/4B, 63/2, and 10/2/1, adm. 48600 sqm and Final Plot No. 305B has been allotted for Gut No. 19/4A (pt) measuring 1215 sq.mt. in the scheme area.
316	Madhukar G Kulkarni, Rajendra G Kulkarni, Neeta Adhikari, Anil G Kulkarni, Aboli A Kulkarni, Vaishali V Kulkarni, Rahul M Kulkarni	Class I	(12/4)	Usarli Khurd	333	360			The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 305A, 310A & 305B have been allotted at the location of part of their original plot with corrections in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
317	Madhukar G Kulkarni, Rajendra G Kulkarni, Neeta Adhikari, Anil G Kulkarni, Aboli A Kulkarni, Vaishali V Kulkarni, Rahul M Kulkarni	Class I	(12/5)	Usarli Khurd	334	287			As per the updated 7/12 extract, the net area remained with the owners after deducting the area under Railway acquisition are; Gut No. 12/4- 360 sq.mt. 12/5- 167 sq.mt., 12/6- 705 sq. mt.
318	Madhukar G Kulkarni, Rajendra G Kulkarni, Neeta Adhikari, Anil G Kulkarni, Aboli A Kulkarni, Vaishali V Kulkarni, Rahul M Kulkarni	Class I	(12/6)	Usarli Khurd	334a	845			Accordingly, the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 306 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
319	Sanjay G. Patkar, Ragunath C Gharat	Class I	(63/1/2)	Usarli Khurd	402	8,000	266	Shri. Sanjay G Patkar attended the hearing and submitted the representation on 08/08/2023. Submission: - 1) Their land bearing survey no 53/1, 2, 3, 45/3/1, 2, 3, 4, 45/4/1, 2, 3, 19/1A/1 to 8 adm. 24620 sqm. is a NA plot for which NA permission and approved building plans were received on 16/02/2010 from Collector Raigad. The proposal was comprised of group housing	The detailed decision was given in Final Plot No. 270. As per their request, the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 266 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.


Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								on 2 plots and bungalow plots on the rest of the area, the group housing was completed and buildings were occupied. The residents of buildings no 1, 2, and 3 formed a society, and conveyance was obtained. Also, conveyance was obtained for building no 4 as a separate society. 2) The balance area after deducting land in the ownership of the said societies is 18615 sqm. (24620-6005) and 40% of this works out to 7446 sqm. Their second plot bearing survey no 63/1/2 measures. 8000 sqm. and its final plot of 40% works out to 3200 sqm. Thus their total final plot area for original plots works out to 10640 sqm. 3) They have submitted 3 options for the said final plot and if they are not found suitable, then their final plot should be located on a 20 m wide road as a single plot.	
320	Ashwini A. Mundhe, Sandhya L. Tiwari	Class I	(10/1B)	Usarli Khurd	321	1,800	309	They 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. 309, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
321	Ramdas K. Bhoir	Class I	(73/0)	Usarli Khurd	412	3,210	311	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 311, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
322	Bama R. Mhatre	Class II	(72/0)	Usarli Khurd	411	3,950	312	They 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. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
323	Eknaath R. Bhopi	Class I	(74/3)	Usarli Khurd	415	3,590	313	They 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. 313, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
324	Tahir A Panvelwala, Shabbir A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Murtaza A Vohra, Aliajgar Vohra, Mohd Ali Vohra	Class I	(74/1)	Usarli Khurd	413	2,410	314, 316, 347	President, Ganesh Krupa Gharkul CHS submitted their presentation dt. 28.08.2023 regarding Gut No. 75/A.	Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. For concession in the marginal spaces, a new regulation has been
325	Eknaath R. Bhopi	Class I	(74/2)	Usarli Khurd	414	1,010		Submission-I. Collector Raigad granted NA cum building permission in their land wide order	



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
326	Chintamani B Dhuri, Menakshi B Dhuri, Dyanand B Dhuri, Tushar D Dhuri, Aarti P Sawant, Leena A Redkar, Deepali D Dhuri, Nafisa F Lokhandwala	Class I	(75/A)	Usarli Khurd	416	8,790		dated 09.05.2023. 2. Unified Development Control & Promotion Regulations (UDCPR) shall be made applicable. 3. 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 space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No.314, 316, 347, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
327	Vincent Luis Mathais	Class I	(71/0)	Usarli Khurd	410	5,790	319	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No.319, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
328	Aambibai H. Bhoir	Class II	(57/3C)	Usarli Khurd	391	2,020	321	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
329	Eknath R Bhoir, Ashok B Bhoir, Atmaram R Bhoir, Shabbir M Sheikh	Class I	(70/0)	Usarli Khurd	409	2,380	322	They 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. 322, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
330	Chandrakant G Mhatre, Dhanaji G Mhatre, Sushila K. Patil, Nira L Waghmare, Anusaya C Patil	Class II	(59/2A)	Usarli Khurd	394	1,500	324	They 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.
331	Janabai L Khopkar, Lilabai V Patil, Hirabai H Patil	Class I	(48/0)	Usarli Khurd	381	5,210	325	They submitted their representation but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them and levy of contribution amount is not acceptable. 2) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 325 has been allotted with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
332	Posha G. Bhoir, Iakhan G. Bhoir, Kamini Bhoir, Ajay G Bhoir, Renuka G Bhoir, Shabbir M Sheikh	Class I	(57/3A)	Usarli Khurd	389	4,000	326	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 326, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
333	Radhabai V Bhoir, Baliram V Bhoir, Gansh V Bhoir, Vithoba V Bhoir, Anita J Bhoir	Class II	(57/3B)	Usarli Khurd	390	2,100	327	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 327, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
334	Gunvant V Abhyankar, Milind B Nene	Class I	(58/0)	Usarli Khurd	392	5,060	329	They 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.
335	Babibai K. Bhoir	Class I	(64/0)	Usarli Khurd	404	2,760	330B	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 330B, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
336	Babibai K. Bhoir	Class I	(69/0)	Usarli Khurd	408	2,380			
337	Babibai K. Bhoir	Class II	(66/0)	Usarli Khurd	406a	1,420	330A	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 330A, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
338	Nirbhaymal Jain, Vijaymal Sand	Class I	(77/1)	Usarli Khurd	422a	5,300	334	They 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.
339	Nirbhaymal Jain, Vijaymal Sand	Class I	(77/3)	Usarli Khurd	422c	592			
340	Nirbhaymal Jain, Vijaymal Sand	Class I	(77/6)	Usarli Khurd	422f	200			
341	Babibai K. Bhoir, Hanuman K. Bhoir, Bansidhar K. Bhoir, Gitabai M. Patil, Vanmala Pandit, Kunda R. Madhavi, Sulochana C. Keni, Sarita S. Gondhali.	Class I	(29/0)	Vichumb e	115	6,200	337	United Builders submitted a representation on 21/08/2023 but did not appear for a hearing. Submission- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot of remaining 40% of land to them is not acceptable. 2) There are existing structures on the proposed final plot no 337 which is not acceptable. 3) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the scheme without their consent and levying contribution charges is itself against natural law. 4) If any land is required for public purposes, it shall be acquired under the LARR Act. 5) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. 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.
342	Mahindra V Naik	Class I	(81/0)	Usarli Khurd	432	20,400	338	Ramchandra Gana Bhagat submitted a representation on 08/08/2023. Submission:- 1) As per Collector, Alibaug order, in 7/12 extract of survey no.81, lease pendancy deeds no. 1145/2013 dated 29/01/23 was registered wide mutation no. 1682. They	It is seen from the submitted documents that Shri. Ramchandra Bhagat filed Special Suit no. 190/2012 in the court of Civil Judge, Sr. Dvn Panvel. As per Section 71 of the MR & TP Act, if a civil court passes any decree in a disputed claim of the




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								have stated that court case no. 6610/2010 in Panvel Civil court is under process and requested not to take final decision till the the decision of the court.	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 have been suitably corrected/varied because of such decree. As per the updated 7/12 extract, the net area of the original land after deducting the area under the railway is 20350 sq.mt. Accordingly, the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 338, area- 8140 sq. mt. has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
343	M/s Kajal Enterprises Owner Shanti Lal D Thakkar	Class I	(77/2)	Usarli Khurd	422b	10,171	339	They submitted the request letter on 7/08/2023 to shift the hearing date to 09/08/2023 and it was accepted. However, they neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 339, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
344	M/s Kajal Enterprises Owner Shanti Lal D Thakkar	Class I	(77/4)	Usarli Khurd	422d	1,127			
345	M/s Kajal Enterprises Owner Shanti Lal D Thakkar	Class I	(77/5)	Usarli Khurd	422e	3,550			
346	Yamuna Ganapat bhoir, Vasant namdev Bhoir, Anant Namdev Bhoir	Class I	(54/2A)	Vichumb e	157	9,820	340	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
347	Tukaram M Bhagat, Buguna bai M Bhagat, Pushpa M Bhagat, Kusum M Bhagat, Parvati M Bhagat, Bhagchand C Khubchandani, Magan bhai Patel, Bhavna B Gathia, Vivek B Bhoir	Class I	(76/4)	Usarli Khurd	420	3,410	341	They submitted their representation on 17/08/2023 but did not appear for a hearing. Submission in representation- 1) They have stated that there are existing houses no. 5001 & 103 on said original property bearing no 76/4 and they have been living there for many years. 2) They requested to grant the final plot in their original land only. They appeared for a hearing and stated that they shall be granted a final plot in place of their existing structures in their original holding.	In the sanctioned Draft Scheme, separate final plot no. 341, 342 & 343 were proposed for Gut No. 76/4, 76/3, & 76/1 respectively. However, during the hearing, they requested to grant a Final plot in place of their existing structures on the original land. Their existing structures are adjoining to each other and situated in the middle of the original land. Accordingly, the layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures, and because of this revised reconstituted combined Final Plot no. 342 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
348	Hanuman G Bhagat	Class I	(76/3)	Usarli Khurd	419	3,390	342	They have submitted their representation on 17/08/2023 Submission in representation- 1) They have stated that there are existing houses no. 83 on said original property bearing no 76/3 and they have been living there for many years. 2) They requested to grant the final plot in their original land only. They appeared for a hearing and stated that they	



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								shall be granted a final plot in place of their existing structures in their original holding.	
349	Laxman G. Bhagat	Class I	(76/1)	Usarli Khurd	418	3,390	343	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	
350	Umabai Bama Mundkar, Krushna Baram Govari, Karuna Baram Govari, Anjali Sitaram Pandit, Ganesh Padya Mundkar, Lilabai Bama Mundkar, Vasanti Baram Govari, Hirabai Baram Govari, Shantabai Goma govani, Rakhmabai Arun bhoir, Lakshman Mahadu Patil, Bebibai Chandrakant Govari, Sonali Chandrakant Govari, Sudarshan Chandrakant Govari, Swati chandrakant Govari, Shraddha Chandrakant Govari, ranjana Padya mundkar, Vaman Rama Govari, devram Baram Govari, Pushpa Ghanshyam Gupta, Fashi Goma Govari, Pramila Padya mundkar, Jaydas Padya Mundkar	Class I	(58/0)	Vichumb e	165	4,900	344	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 344, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
351	Lansi M. Barboja	Class I	(75/B)	Usarli Khurd	417	8,000	348	They 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.
352	Stanis L C Desuza, Pamela F Desuza	Class I	(87/1)	Usarli Khurd	445	7,590	351	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 351, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
353	Sugandha S. Paradkar	Class I	(87/2)	Usarli Khurd	446	2,000	352	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
354	Ramchandra Gana Bhagat, Asha Kamalakar Bhagat, Lakshmi Gana Bhagat, Anita Anata Bhagat, Savita Yashvant Bhopi, Manoj Ananta Bhagat, Sanchita Ravindra Bhoir, Bharti Pradip Surve, Pranali Purushottam Bhoir, Sushila Vittal Zavare, Niranjana Eknath Govari, Bhupali Kamalakar Bhagat, Devendra Gana Bhagat, Vilas Ramchandra Jadhav, Padmini Vilas Jadhav, Manoj Anant Bhagat, Ashabai Anant Bhagat, Sanchita Ravindra Bhoir,	Class I	(86/1/1)	Usarli Khurd	440	19,250	354	Adv. Sachin Patil on behalf of Ramchandra Bhagat submitted their representation on 08/08/2023. Submission- 1) The proposed final plot consists of their existing structures, therefore, shall be kept as proposed. 2) They requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) 2.5 FSI 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	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, 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-7. 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. 354, as shown in plan No. 4, has been



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
	Pranali Prakash Zavare, Rupuli Sachin Patil, Manoj Ananta Bhagat, Bharti Pradip Surve, Anita Ananta Bhagat, Vaishali Santosh Pardeshi, Pranali Purushottam Bhoir							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.	allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
355	Ramchandra G. Bhagat	Class I	(86/1/3)	Usarli Khurd	443	2,400	355	They submitted their representation on 08/08/2023. Submission- 1) The proposed final plot consists of their existing structures, therefore, shall be kept as proposed. 2) They requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) 2.5 FSI 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-7, 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-7. 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. 355, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
356	Krushna M Bhoir, Aanu M Bhoir, Leela G Pardeshi, Anjira A Govari	Class II	(86/2)	Usarli Khurd	444	710	356	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
357	Dilip C Bhagat, Deepti D Bhagat, Deepali P Joshi, Hemant D Bhagat, Mukesh D Bhagat	Class I	(86/1/2/1)	Usarli Khurd	441	11,656	358	Shri. Hemant Bhagat submitted a presentation on 07/08/23 Submission- 1) They stated that there is an existing house no. 734 on said original property bearing Gut no 86/1/2 & 9. and requested to grant the final plot in their original land only.	As per the updated 7/12 extract, the net area of the original land after deducting the area under the railway is 9896 sq. mt. Accordingly, the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 358, area- 3958 sq. mt. has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
358	Maya S. Bhagat	Class I	(80/2)	Usarli Khurd	430	11,600	359	They 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. 359, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
359	Paresh S Patel, Navneet S Patel	Class I	(78/1/1)	Usarli Khurd	423	10,550	360	They 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.
360	Paresh S Patel, Navneet S Patel	Class I	(78/1/2)	Usarli Khurd	424	1,516			



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
361	Nirbhaymal Jain	Class I	(79/1)	Usarli Khurd	427	2,530	361	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
362	Nirbhaymal Jain	Class I	(79/2)	Usarli Khurd	428	6,800			
363	Vishwas L. Bhagat	Class I	(78/2)	Usarli Khurd	425	4,047	364	They 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.
364	Ajit B. Katti	Class I	(78/3)	Usarli Khurd	426	4,047	365	They 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. 365, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
365	Mohan T. Bhagat, Raja T. Bhagat, Ratan T. Bhagat, Kiran T. Bhagat, Sanjay T. Bhagat, Krushabai T. Bhagat	Class I	(80/3)	Usarli Khurd	431	4,300	366	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 366, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
366	Vijay Narottamdas Agrawal	Class I	(59/1)	Usarli Khurd	393	500	367	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
367	Vijay Narottamdas Agrawal	Class I	(60/1)	Usarli Khurd	396	710			
368	Vijay Narottamdas Agrawal	Class I	(60/2)	Usarli Khurd	397	1,210			
369	Vijay Narottamdas Agrawal	Class I	(60/3)	Usarli Khurd	398	1,010			
370	Vijay Narottamdas Agrawal	Class I	(61/0)	Usarli Khurd	399	3,340			
371	Vijay Narottamdas Agrawal	Class I	(65/0)	Usarli Khurd	405	2,730			
372	Vijay Narottamdas Agrawal	Class I	(68/0)	Usarli Khurd	407	1,640			
373	Ganpat S. Bhagat	Class I	(80/1)	Usarli Khurd	429	8,360	368	They 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. 368, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
374	Jagdish D. Bhagat, Tai M Bhagat, Dhakli D Bhagat, Narayan D Bhagat, Vasanti H Patil, Vishnu D Bhagat	Class II	(206/3)	Shivkar	688	2,780	369	They submitted their representation on 13/09/2023 but did not appear for a hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed.

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								public purpose; including them in the 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-7	Final Plot No. 369, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
375	National Builders through partner M. C. Sanni, Cijo Sanni	Class I	(27(P)/2(P))	Vichumb e	113	5,855	370	They appeared for the hearing on 08/08/2023. 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-7, 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-7. 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. 370, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
376	Eknath B Bhagat, Radhabai K Mhatre, Krushna R Bhagat, Harreswar R Bhagat, Dwarkabai Y Patil, Kashibai H Govari, Shaila S Joshi, Seema C Pardeshi, Vandana B Pardeshi	Class I	(83/1)	Usarli Khurd	434	22,740	371, 376	They submitted their representation on 08/08/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation-1) There are existing mango, and coconut trees in their original property bearing survey no 83/1 and also rice and cereals cultivation is done on said land and their livelihood is dependent on their income. 2) Village Usarli Khurd is in close proximity to Panvel City where development has already started and they are satisfied with it, therefore TP scheme 7 is not accepted by them. 3) In the future, if their land is acquired then the plot shall be granted in their original property bearing survey no 83/1.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. As per the updated 7/12 extract, the net area of the original land after deducting the area under the railway is 16,180 sq.mt. Accordingly, the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 371A, 376, area- 6,472 sq. mt. have been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
377	Raghunath G. Waghmare, Gana B. Waghmare, Ashok Waghmare, Dipak Waghmare, Baby Waghmare, Chandra Patil, Laxmi More, Vandana Mali, Jyoti Palake, Sugandha Waghmare	Class I	(21/1)	Vichumb e	107	4,270	372	They submitted their representation on 08/08/2023 but did not appear for a hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
378	Raghunath G. Waghmare, Gana B. Waghmare, Ashok Waghmare, Dipak Waghmare, Baby Waghmare, Chandra Patil, Laxmi More, Vandana Mali, Jyoti Palake, Sugandha Waghmare	Class I	(21/2)	Vichumb e	108	3,340		CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
379	Maya B Surte, Namdev Surte, Prakash Surte, Vithabai Patil, Dharmibai Surte, Janabai Surte, Nishikant Surte, Sanjivani Bhoir, Bhagyashri Punkar, Rajashri Surte, Tejashri Banda, Revati Karkide, Yamuna Surte	Class II	(27/1)	Vichumb e	112	7,260	373	They submitted their representation on 14/08/2023 but did not appear for a hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 373, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
414	Vasanti V. Bhagat, Santosh V Bhagat, Nitesh V Bhagat, Gopal P Bhagat, Prachi D Bhagat, Chirag D Bhagat, Darshna D Bhagat, Vardarajan Urf Ashokkumar K Nainar	Class I	(206/1)	Shivkar	686	2,780	375	They submitted their representation on 13/09/2023 but did not appear for a hearing. Submission in representation- 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) NAINA TPS has no public purpose; including them in the 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-7	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 375, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
415	Shailesh C. Deshpande	Class I	(64(P)/2B (P))	Vichumb e	179	15,385	377	Partner, M/s National Builders appeared for the hearing on 08/08/2023.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
416	Rakesh Pravin Sanghavi, M/s. Ashapura Realtors register behalf partner corporation, M. C. Sani, M/s National builders behalf Partner	Class I	(64(P)/2A (P))	Vichumb e	178	-		Submission in hearing- 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant independent final plot for their land bearing survey no 64/2A. 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.	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-7. 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 the updated 7/12 extract, the total area of owners of Gat no 64/2A and 64/2B is 17780 sqm. Out of that, 3897 sqm. has been included in TP Scheme no 5 and 13883 sqm. remains in TP Scheme no 7. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 377, has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
417	Bharat Patel, Bhavesh Patel, M/s. Aawas Associates through Partners	Class I	(162/1)	Usarli Khurd	524	116		They appeared for the hearing on 08/08/2023. Submission in hearing- 1) Sub-divisional Officer vide order dt. 24/01/1992 approved layout in Gut no 88/1 and 88/3. They purchased subplot no 1, 2, and 5 in the said layout. which were subsequently numbered as 162/1- 476 sqm. , 162/2,- 308 sqm. 162/5 - 283 sqm. total 1067 sqm. Accordingly, they are entitled to a final plot of 426.8 sqm. area. However, they have been granted a final plot of 225.19 sqm. area. So they requested to grant the final plot of 426.8 sqm. area. 2) They 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-7, 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-7. 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. They have been granted the final plot as per the area mentioned in the 7/12 extract i.e. net area after deducting the area under the Railway acquisition. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in final plot as 498. 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.
418	Bharat Patel, Bhavesh Patel, M/s. Aawas Associates through Partners	Class I	(162/5)	Usarli Khurd	528	139			
419	Bharat Patel, Bhavesh Patel, M/s. Aawas Associates through Partners	Class I	(162/2)	Usarli Khurd	525	308	383+ 385+ 388		
420	Indu Gupta, Surinder Kumar Kaul, Y.D. Vashijha	Class I	(162/6)	Usarli Khurd	529	148	384	They neither appeared for the hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 398 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as


Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
421	Vishnu Dharma Bhagat, Vaman Dharma Bhagat	Class I	(162/7)	Usarli Khurd	530	336	386	They appeared for the hearing on 08/08/2023. 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-7, 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-7. 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 requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 386 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
422	Vaman D Bhagat, Vishnu D Bhagat, Manik C Patil, Radhabai B Bhagat, Ajay B Bhagat, Chaya B Bhagat, Sanjay B Bhagat, Ganapat B Bhagat	Class I	(84/1)	Usarli Khurd	436	13,430	389	They appeared for the hearing on 08/08/2023. Submission in hearing- 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, mentioned that their farmhouse has existed in the said land since 1993. In the sanctioned draft scheme the strip of open land is proposed adjoining the railway boundary and thereafter 20 m road has been proposed. Their farmhouse is partly affected by said road and final plot no 389 is proposed along the said road. Therefore, they requested to reduce the width of the said road and grant a final plot with their entire farmhouse. 2) They also requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 23) 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 space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, 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-7. 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 the updated 7/12 extract, the net area of the original land after deducting the area under the railway is 10,430 sq.mt. Accordingly, the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 384, area- 4172 sq. mt. has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
423	Mirlmdad Ali M Ali, M Qureshi, Nawaz Khan N Ahemad, Vinaya V Dukhande	Class I	(88/4)	Usarli Khurd	448	740	390	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per the updated 7/12 extract, the net area of the original land after deducting the area under the railway is 460 sq.mt. Accordingly, the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 385, area-184 sq. mt. has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
424	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(1/0)	Usarli Khurd	286	1,420	391, 393	Bharat & Bhavesh Patel appeared for the hearing on 08/08/2023. Submission in hearing- 1.) They have accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS. However, requested to grant a rectangular-shaped final plot on a 15 mt. wide road. 2.) They claimed that area of survey no. 93/0 is 1640 sq. mt instead of 1380 sq.mt.as mentioned in form 1 of the scheme. 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. 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-7, 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-7. 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.
425	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner Bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(2/0)	Usarli Khurd	287	2,020			
426	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner Bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(3/1)	Usarli Khurd	288	710			
427	Bhavesh K. Patel, M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner Bharat K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(3/2)	Usarli Khurd	289	810			
428	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(89/1)	Usarli Khurd	449	4,270			
429	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(89/2)	Usarli Khurd	450	3,060			
430	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(89/5)	Usarli Khurd	453	1,690			
431	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(89/6)	Usarli Khurd	454	5,410			
432	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(89/8)	Usarli Khurd	456	1,420			
433	Dipak P. Thakre, M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel	Class I	(89/9)	Usarli Khurd	457	1,010			
434	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(89/10)	Usarli Khurd	458	1,090		Shri. Harishchandra Bhagat submitted representation dated 07/08/23. Submission:- 1) They have stated that there is an existing house on said original property. 2) They requested to grant the final plot in their original land only.	As per Section 71 of the MR & TP Act, if a civil court passes any decree 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 have been suitably corrected/varied because of such decree.
435	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(89/11)	Usarli Khurd	459	4,550			
								Adv. Rajesh Meher, on behalf of Shri Sadanand Krismatrao, submitted their representation dated 24/04/2023 to CIDCO (NAINA). Submission- 1) Their client has submitted special suit no. 320/2019.2) Their client has legal rights on the suit lands and without the consent of their client, if the new plot for the suit lands has been granted to M/s Aawas Associate in TPS-7, it will be a great loss to their client.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 388 & 390 have been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
436	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(93/0)	Usarli Khurd	463	1,380		Shri Shankar Bhagat and others, regarding Gut no., 91 submitted a presentation dated 21/08/2023 Submission- 1) 2.5 FSI shall be granted and UDCPR shall be made applicable 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. 4) The said plots are proposed along the river and therefore NAINA shall expand the width and depth of the river after taking permission from Irrigation Dept.	
437	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(89/3)	Usarli Khurd	451	4,180			
438	M/s Aawas Asso. Partners association through partner bharat K. Patel, Bhavesh K. Patel, Dipak P. Thakre	Class I	(90/0)	Usarli Khurd	460	1,210			
439	Prakash V Desai, Sangeeta P Desai	Class I	(89/7)	Usarli Khurd	455	1,190			
440	Dhavu K Bhagat, Janardhan G Bhagat, Manohar G Bhagat, Shankar Babu (Alias Padu Bhagat), Chau Babu (Alias Padu Bhagat), Sanjay B Bhagat, Santosh B Bhagat, Sunanda V Govari, Hirabai B Bhagat, Kamlabai C Govari, Manda U Patil, Anil B Bhagat, Leela K Patil, Pushpa S Patil, Bamibai J Bhagat, Gajanan J Bhagat, Ranjana S Bhoir, Padmakar K Bhagat, Narayan Babu (Alias Padu Bhagat), Parvati N Bhagat, Vandana P Gondhali, Shanta P Bhoir, Sharda N Bhagat, Ganesh N Bhagat, Rekha K Patil, Ajinkya D Bhagat, Aditya D Bhagat, Ameya D Bhagat, Sudha D Bhagat	Class I	(91/0)	Usarli Khurd	461	10,850			
441	Harishchandra B Bhagat, Radha bai K Mhatre	Class I	(92/0)	Usarli Khurd	462	9,330	392	Radhabai Mhatre & Harishchandra Bhagat submitted a representation on 08/08/23 Submission:-1) They stated that their land bearing survey no. 92, area 9330 sqm., is under agricultural use and is the only source of livelihood for them. 2) They requested to grant the final plot as per their consent.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in final plot no. as 389. 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.
442	Ramesh N. Rudhani	Class I	(89/4)	Usarli Khurd	452	940	394	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in final plot no. as 392. Final Plot No. 392 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
443	Akbaralli R. Bohari	Class I	(85/1)	Usarli Khurd	438	710	395	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per the updated 7/12 extract, the net area of the original land after deducting the area under the railway is 360 sq.mt. Accordingly, the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 393, area-



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									144 sq. mt. has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
444	Sagar S. Khond	Class I	(7/1/1C)	Usarli Khurd	300	1,821	396	Shri. Narendra Gowari submitted representation dated 12.06.2023. Submission: 1.) In the final plot granted to them, there is an existing structure therefore they requested to change the final plot.	There are many structures in Gut no. 7/1 and the boundaries of Gut no. 7/1/1C, 7/1B, 7/1A/1, & 7/1/1B/1 are not available. In the sanctioned Draft Scheme, Final plots no. 396, 402, & 408 were arbitrarily proposed in Gut no. 7/1. Also as per the updated 7/12 extract, the net area of Gut no. 7/1B after deducting the land under the railway is 465 sq. mt. Therefore the said Gut nos. 7/1/1C, 7/1B, 7/1A/1, & 7/1/1B/1 are clubbed together and combined Final Plot No. 396 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
445	Sagar S. Khond	Class I	(7/1B)	Usarli Khurd	301	910			
446	Dharma V. Patil, Mahendra M. Patil	Class I	(7/2)	Usarli Khurd	304	1,520	397	Shri. Mukund Patil and Dharma Patil submitted a presentation dated 24/08/23 Submission- 1) Their shares in the original land bearing Survey no. 7/2 are separated and therefore requested to grant separate final plots to each of them.2) They have RCC house no.654 in the said land and requested its compensation. 3) Betterment charges shall be waived. Shri Dinesh Katave submitted a representation dated 25/08/23 Submission- Special Civil suit no. 18/2021 regarding Gut no. 7/2 has been filed in Civil court, Panvel, and therefore no decision shall be taken, till the decision in the pending suit.	The Special Civil Suit no. 18/2021 is regarding Gut no. 7/1(1) B/2. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering their existing structures, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 401 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
447	Anil S. Jadhav, Kashinath K. Suvase, Gabrielle Aulwin, Tukaram S. Kadam, Prabhakar S. More, Raosaheb C. Walke, Bipin M. Paradhi, Vijay K.M. Kurup, Ruku Digprasad Shresth, Rahul Digprasad Shresth, Dinesh Digprasad Shresth, Suman Digprasad Shresth, Ujwala ashok Gurav, Dkshta Ashok Gurav, Kalpesh Ashok Gurav	Class I	(7/1/2/1/1)	Usarli Khurd	303	369	398	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Tahsildar, Panvel, wide order No. NA/kat-1/SR/90/1990 dated 21/06/1990 had granted NA cum layout permission for residential use in survey no. 7-1A (2), 4047 sq. mt. As per the sanctioned Draft Scheme, their plot under the layout was affected by the proposals of 20.0 mt wide roads on both the side of the railway line and Green Belt and therefore their Final Plot was proposed in Gut No. 7/1, wherein structures exist. Considering that it is a sanctioned layout plot, the final plot of 100% of their original land (84 sq.mt.) has been allotted in a nearby location of their original land.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									The layout of the scheme has been revised and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 394 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
448	Keshav T. Gawande, Vinayak D. Thakare, Sunanda R. Gawande, Sanajy B. Walake	Class I	(7/1A/2/3)	Usarli Khurd	305	392	399	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	<p>Tahsildar, Panvel, wide order No. NA/kat-1/SR/90/1990 dated 21/06/1990 had granted NA cum layout permission for residential use in survey no. 7-1A (2), 4047 sq. mt.</p> <p>As per the sanctioned Draft Scheme, their plot under the layout was affected by the proposals of 20.0 mt wide roads on both the side of the railway line and Green Belt and therefore their Final Plot was proposed in Gut No. 7/1, wherein structures exist.</p> <p>Considering that it is a sanctioned layout plot, the final plot of 100% of their original land (312 sq. mt) has been allotted in a nearby location of their original land.</p> <p>The layout of the scheme has been revised and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no.410 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.</p>
449	Manohar C. Surte	Class I	(7/1A/2/8)	Usarli Khurd	307	419	400	<p>Shri. Manohar Surte appeared for a hearing</p> <p>Submission in hearing: - 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and requested to grant the final plot of 100% of their holding in their original land only, otherwise, compensation shall be granted as per Airport acquisition. 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>Tahsildar, Panvel, wide order No. NA/kat-1/SR/90/1990 dated 21/06/1990 had granted NA cum layout permission for residential use in survey no. 7-1A(2), 4047 sq. mt.</p> <p>As per the sanctioned Draft Scheme, their plot under the layout was affected by the proposals of 20.0 mt wide roads on both the side of the railway line and Green Belt and therefore their Final Plot was proposed in Gut No. 7/1, wherein structures exist.</p> <p>Considering that it is a sanctioned layout plot, the final plot of 100% of their original land has been allotted in a nearby location of their original land.</p> <p>The layout of the scheme has been revised and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 409 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.</p>



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
450	Ashok R. Shirke	Class I	(7/1A/2/9)	Usarli Khurd	308	210	401	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	According to Mutation entry no.918, Tahsildar, Panvel, wide order No. NA/kat-1/SR/90/1990 dated 21/06/1990 had granted NA permission for residential use in survey no. 7-1A (2), 4047 sq. mt. Accordingly, the land was subdivided into 8 plots, 210.24 sq. mt was placed under road and 405.25 sq. mt was placed under Open Space. In the other right column of 7/12 extract of Gut no. 7/1A/2/9 and 7/1A/2/10, the said Gut nos are mentioned under road & khulijaga respectively.
451	Ashok R. Shirke	Class I	(7/1A/2/10)	Usarli Khurd	309	405			As per the provisions of DC regulations, the land under the layout road has to be transferred to the planning authority and open space has to be transferred to the plot owners' society. The lands under the layout road and open space in the sanctioned layout are not entitled to a Final plot. Therefore the proposed Final plots in the draft scheme for the original lands bearing Gut no. 7/1A/2/9 and 7/1A/2/10 are cancelled.
452	Mohan T. Bhagat, Raja T. Bhagat, Ratan T. Bhagat, Kiran T. Bhagat, Sanjay T. Bhagat, Krushabai T. Bhagat	Class I	(7/1A/1)	Usarli Khurd	299	1,750	402	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	There are many structures in Gut no. 7/1 and the boundaries of Gut no. 7/1/1C, 7/1B, 7/1A/1, & 7/1/1B/1 are not available. In the sanctioned Draft Scheme, Final plots no. 396, 402, & 408 were arbitrarily proposed in Gut no. 7/1. Therefore the said Gut nos. 7/1/1C, 7/1B, 7/1A/1, & 7/1/1B/1 are clubbed together and combined Final Plot No. 396 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
453	Riddi Siddhi Usarli Sahakari Gruhnirman Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(6/1)	Usarli Khurd	293	284	403	Chairman Riddhi Siddhi Society submitted representation dated 09/08/23. Submission: - 1.) They requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) 2.50 FSI 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	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, 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-7. 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.
454	Riddi Siddhi Usarli Sahakari Gruhnirman Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(6/2)	Usarli Khurd	294	320			The layout of the scheme has been revised for
455	Riddi Siddhi Usarli Sahakari Gruhnirman Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(6/3)	Usarli Khurd	295	360			
456	Riddi Siddhi Usarli Sahakari Gruhnirman Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(6/4)	Usarli Khurd	296	296			
457	Riddi Siddhi Usarli Sahakari Gruhnirman Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(6/5)	Usarli Khurd	297	288			



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
458	Riddi Siddhi Usarli Sahakari Gruhnirman Sanstha Ltd.	Class I	(6/6)	Usarli Khurd	298	142		Building, concession in the marginal space shall be granted and for that, the premium shall not be charged.	planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 397 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
459	Vandana V. Shete, Baliram P. Mhatre, Subhas Yadav Talele, Sunanda Dhundre	Class I	(5/0)	Usarli Khurd	292	3,090	405	They submitted a representation dated 09/08/23. 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. 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-7, 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-7. 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 requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 405 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
460	Sarita D Mhatre, Manisha D Mhatre, Mahesh D Mhatre, Mohini D Mhatre, Naina D Mhatre, Madhukar S Mhatre, Shobha S Mhatre, Girish S Mhatre, Latika S Mhatre, Arun S Mhatre, Lilabai K Mhatre, Tai G Jale, Asha A Thale	ClassII	(67/0)	Usarli Khurd	406	660	406	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to change in final plot no. 402. 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.
461	Kanthale Machindra Rajhans	Class I	(7/1A/2/6)	Usarli Khurd	306	270	407	Shri. Machindra Kanthale appeared for a hearing Submission in hearing: - 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and requested to grant the final plot of 100% of their holding in their original land only, otherwise, compensation shall be granted as per Airport acquisition. 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) Their area as per the 7/12 extract is	Tahsildar, Panvel, wide order No. NA/kat-1/SR/90/1990 dated 21/06/1990 had granted NA cum layout permission for residential use in survey no. 7-1A (2), 4047 sq. mt. As per the sanctioned Draft Scheme, their plot under the layout was affected by the proposals of 20.0 mt wide roads on both the side of the railway line and Green Belt and therefore their Final Plot was proposed in Gut No. 7/1, wherein structures exist. Considering that it is a sanctioned layout plot, the final plot of 100% of their original land (279 sq. mt) has been allotted in a nearby location of their original land. The layout of the scheme has been revised and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 412 has been allotted with correction in the area as



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								279 sq. mt and accordingly record shall be corrected.	shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
462	Pradeep V. Gupta	Class I	(7/1/1B/1)	Usarli Khurd	302	1,518	408	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	There are many structures in Gut no. 7/1 and the boundaries of Gut no. 7/1/1C, 7/1B, 7/1A/1, & 7/1/1B/1 are not available. In the sanctioned Draft Scheme, Final plots no. 396, 402, & 408 were arbitrarily proposed in Gut no. 7/1. Therefore the said Gut nos. 7/1/1C, 7/1B, 7/1A/1, & 7/1/1B/1 are clubbed together and combined Final Plot No. 396 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
463	Kanchan K. Sontakke	Class I	(55/0)	Vichumb e	162	3,900	409	Smt. Kanchan Sontakke appeared for a hearing Submission in hearing: - 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and requested to grant the final plot in their original land only, 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.	In the sanctioned development plan of NAINA, their original land bearing Gut no. 55 of village Vichumb e is under the reservation of Growth Centre and therefore they have been granted the final plot at another location in the same village fronting on 12.0 mt. wide layout road. Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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. 391 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
464	Sunita V. More, Sandeep S. Talwalkar	Class I	(4/1)	Usarli Khurd	290	870	410	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 404 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
465	Varsha R. Teredesai	Class I	(4/2)	Usarli Khurd	291	2,100	411	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per updated 7/12 extract, the total area of Gat no 4/2 is 870 sqm. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 403 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
466	Krushna Dharma Bhingarkar, Ganapat Nama Bhingarkar, Vasudev Dharma Bhingarkar	Class I	(53/0)	Vichumb e	151	1,640	412	They submitted their representation on 26/07/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. 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 regarding the inclusion of them in the said scheme.	Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 400 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
467	Alhaj M. Mustapha Yakub Beg-Chief Trusty, Yusuf A. Khan, Imran S. Khan. Allabaksh A. Mulla, M. Taslim M. Husen	Class I	(9/1)	Usarli Khurd	317	6,120	413	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	As per the updated 7/12 extract, the net area of the original land after deducting the area under the railway is 3310 sq.mt. Accordingly, the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 413, area- 1324 sq. mt. has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
468	Abhimanyu U Tavade, Narayan K Gavand	Class I	(158/3/2)	Usarli Khurd	514	1,580	415	They 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. 406 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
469	Namdev L. Bhagat	Class I	(10/4A/2)	Usarli Khurd	326	1,510	417	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	the layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 417, area has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
470	Dattatreya Walke, Rajendra Gavande, Ramchandra Lokhande	Class I	(7/1/A/2/2/1)	Usarli Khurd	310	350	419	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Tahsildar, Panvel, wide order No. NA/kat-1/SR/90/1990 dated 21/06/1990 had granted NA cum layout permission for residential use in survey no. 7-1A (2), 4047 sq. mt. As per the sanctioned Draft Scheme, their plot under the layout was affected by the proposals of 20.0 mt wide roads on both the side of the railway line and Green Belt and therefore their Final Plot was proposed in Gut No. 7/1, wherein structures exist. Considering that it is a sanctioned layout plot, the final plot of 100% of their original land (170 sq.mt.) has been allotted in a nearby location of their original land. The layout of the scheme has been revised and

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
471	Tahir A Panvelwala, Mustafa A Vhora, Alisagar A Vhora, Mohammad A Vhora, Shabbir A Vhora, Murtaza A Vhora	Class I	(160/3)	Usarli Khurd	522	510	419A	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 411 has been allotted with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
472	Kankeshwar V. Pardeshi, A.P.K, Sushma V. Pardeshi	Class I	(10/3)	Usarli Khurd	324	1,440	420	Smt. Nishali Zavare submitted a representation dated 08/08/23 Submission: - 1.) They requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) 2.50 FSI 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) Regular Civil suit no. 143/2015 has been filed in the court of Civil Judge, Sr. Dn, Panvel and it is pending for decision. In the said suit, smt. Nishali Zavare contended for the ownership of Gut no. 10/2, 10/3, & 45/6 of village UsarliKhurd, Panvel.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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 Section 71 of the MR & TP Act, if a civil court passes any decree 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 have been suitably corrected/varied because of such decree. As per the updated 7/12 extract, the net area of the original land after deducting the area under the railway is 1315 sq. mt. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 408 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
473	Panvel Lalit Shanti Co. O. HO. Sco. S. J. S. Shah, Secretary, K S Chavhan, C S Rao	Class I	(13(pt)/1B/2)	Usarli Khurd	336	2,247	421	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 420 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
474	Panvel Lalit Shanti Co. O. HO. Sco. S. J. S. Shah, Secretary, K S Chavhan, C S Rao	Class I	(13(pt)/1B/3)	Usarli Khurd	337	-			
475	Shashikala Pai	Class I	(13(pt)/1B)	Usarli Khurd	335	-			
476	Shashikala Pai	Class I	(13(pt)/1B/4)	Usarli Khurd	338	-			




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
477	Shashikala Pai	Class I	(13(pt)/1B/5)	Usarli Khurd	339	-			
478	Shashikala Pai	Class I	(13(pt)/1B/6)	Usarli Khurd	340	-			
479	Shashikala Pai	Class I	(13(pt)/1B/7)	Usarli Khurd	341	-			
480	Kantuben Rajabhai, (Alias Kanta M.Chouhan), Khusboo N. Dave	Class I	(10/5)	Usarli Khurd	327	1,470	422	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 419 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
481	Pandurang K. Bhagat	Class I	(10/4A/1)	Usarli Khurd	325	2,780	423	Shri. Pandurang Bhagat submitted a representation dt. 24/08/23 Submission:- They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and requested to grant the final plot in their original land only, Also, requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 423 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
482	Rajesh Anant Chaudhary, Babibai dhanaji Bhagat	Class I	(159/C)	Usarli Khurd	521	200	424	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 424 has been allotted with correction in the area and ownership as shown in the plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
483	Krushna Mahadu Bhoir	Class I	(159/A)	Usarli Khurd	519	400	425	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 421 has been allotted with correction in the area and ownership as shown in the plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
484	Mohan Nanaji Bhimani Patel, Bharat Kanji Shah	Class I	(159/B)	Usarli Khurd	520	2,000	426	They appeared for a hearing on 10/08/2023 Submission in hearing:- 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and submitted a different option for the final plot. 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	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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.




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								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.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 310B has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
485	Asha B Patil, Lata D Patil	Class I	(158/3/1)	Usarli Khurd	513	1,560	427	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 425 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
486	Karnala Ent through Partners Vivekanand S Patil, Eknath R Bhopi, Mukund S Mhatre	Class I	(158/1)	Usarli Khurd	511	2,780	434	They 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.
487	Karnala Ent through Partners Vivekanand S Patil, Eknath R Bhopi, Mukund S Mhatre	Class I	(158/6)	Usarli Khurd	517	530			
488	Karnala Ent through Partners Vivekanand S Patil, Eknath R Bhopi, Mukund S Mhatre	Class I	(158/7)	Usarli Khurd	518	1,060			
489	Holaram Premchand Devani	Class I	(108/0)	Usarli Khurd	476	3,310	437	Shri. Ajit Holaram Devani submitted a representation dated 21/08/23. Submission:- 1.) They requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) 2.50 FSI 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 IDP reservation of STP on their original land shall be canceled and they shall be granted the final plot therein. 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.	Town Planning Scheme no.7 has been proposed for the implementation of the sanctioned Development plan and therefore IDP reservation of STP can not be canceled. Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, 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-7. 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.
490	Holaram Premchand Devani	Class I	(109/0)	Usarli Khurd	477	11,150			
491	Holaram Premchand Devani	Class I	(110/2)	Usarli Khurd	479	2,000			
									The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
492	Shubhangi G Dhuri, Anand G Dhuri, Ajay G Dhuri, Amita V Angne	Class I	(102/1)	Usarli Khurd	468	8,150	438	<p>Shri. Ajay Dhuri appeared for a hearing on 10/08/2023</p> <p>Submission in hearing: - 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and requested to grant the final plot on 20 mt. wide 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>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, 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-7. 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>
493	Shubhangi G Dhuri, Anand G Dhuri, Ajay G Dhuri, Amita V Angne	Class I	(102/2)	Usarli Khurd	469	2,270			<p>The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.</p>
494	Amita S. Khond, Sagar S Khond	Class I	(206/2)	Shivkar	687	4,040	439	<p>Abhinav Chheda, Partner, M/s Dukes Developers LLP submitted a representation dated 23/05/23 but did not appear for a hearing. Submission: - They purchased the original land bearing survey no. 206/2, area- 4040 sq. mt. wide sale agreement dated 30/03/2023 and requested to change the ownership of the said land in the record of TPS-7.</p>	<p>The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 439 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.</p>
495	Dattu G. Bhagat	Class I	(76/2)	Usarli Khurd	421	3,390	440	<p>They submitted the representation on 04/10/2023 but did not appeared for hearing. Submission in representation: 1) They requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land.2) Their final plot no 440 adm. 1708 sqm. is proposed in Kolkhe viollage for the original land bearing survy no 76/2, 88/2 and 158/5. Their houses are present in the original survey no 76/2 in Vichumbe from 1989-90 bearing house Assessment no 352/A, 352/B and 48. So they</p>	<p>Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, 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-7. 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>
496	Dattu G. Bhagat	Class I	(88/2)	Usarli Khurd	447	350			<p>As per their request, the layout of the scheme has</p>



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
497	Dattu G. Bhagat	Class I	(158/5)	Usarli Khurd	516	530		requested to allot final plot at their original property bearing survey no 76/2. 3) Permissible 2.50 FSI on the final 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.	been revised and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 345B has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
498	Dukes Developers Pvt. Ltd., Aditya B Co. Ho Sco. Ltd,	Class I	(107/0)	Usarli Khurd	475	18,670	441	Their representation is mentioned in FP no. 24, 129.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 441 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
499	Ananta P. Bhoir	Class I	(103/0)	Usarli Khurd	470	7,990	443	They 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.
500	Ananta P. Bhoir	Class I	(104/0)	Usarli Khurd	471	1,720			
501	Ananta P. Bhoir	Class I	(152(P)/0)	Usarli Khurd	505	290			
502	Ananta P. Bhoir	Class I	(156/0)	Usarli Khurd	508	2,630			
503	Satish S Jadhav, Dilip S Jadhav	Class I	(57/1)	Usarli Khurd	387	2,170	447	Shri Dilip Jadhav appeared for the hearing on 08/08/2023. 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. Advocate Shri. Uttam Chavan has submitted	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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, the layout of the scheme has been revised and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no.320B has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								representation dated 12/09/23 on behalf of Kishore Patil and 11 others and claimed that their clients booked flats in the scheme on the said land and requested to record an objection to the acquisition of property under the NAINA scheme.	
504	Chintamani B Dhuri, Meenakshi B Dhuri, Dyanand B Dhuri	Class I	(105(P)/B(P))	Usarli Khurd	473	3,900	448	They 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.
505	Dukes Developers Pvt. Ltd.	Class I	(105(P)/A(P))	Usarli Khurd	472	9,890	449	Their representation is mentioned in FP no. 24, 129	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
506	Saifuddin M Vhora, Ammar M Vhora, Jujar M Panvelwala, Joher M Vhora, Indris M Vhora	Class I	(114/1A)	Usarli Khurd	486	16,227	453	They submitted their objection dated 10/08/2023 Submission: - 1) Their property bearing survey no. 114/1A, 16227 sq. mt. is NA property. 2) 1.) They have not accepted the allotted Final Plot no. 453 measuring 6491 sq. mt. and requested to allot a final plot of 16227 sq. mt. 3) The contribution amount as per form no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 4) NAINA should give them freehold rights of the allotted plot and not leasehold rights.	They have not submitted any documents showing inforce sanctioned development permission in the original land and therefore their request to grant the final plot of 100% of the original land can not be considered. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The tenure of the original land will remain intact in the final plot. The layout of the scheme has been revised and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 453 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
507	Rakesh C Gupta, M/s SS Asso Prop.	Class I	(116/0)	Usarli Khurd	488	4,070	454	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
508	Rakesh C Gupta, M/s SS Asso Prop.	Class I	(118/0)	Usarli Khurd	490	1,820			
509	Rakesh C Gupta, M/s SS Asso Prop.	Class I	(119(pt)/1)	Usarli Khurd	492	5,233			
510	Chandrabhaga G. Gaikawad, Santosh G. Gaikawad, Krushna M. Gaikawad, Manda A. Jadhav, Rekha S. Jadhav, Sujata V. Waghmare, Rupa G. Gaikawad, Kalpna M. Gaikawad	Class II	(87/0)	Vichumb e	201	4,150	456	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 456 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
511	Bhagchand C Khubchandani, Maganbhai N Patel, Bhavna B Gadhiya	Class I	(59/2B)	Usarli Khurd	395	2,480	457	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 457 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
512	Vijay N Agrawal, Madhu V Agrawal	Class I	(62/0)	Usarli Khurd	400	1,520	458	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 458 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
513	Kisan K Bhagat, Damu K Bhagat, Sanivari G Bhoir, Aanandibai D Ghate	Class II	(150/2)	Usarli Khurd	504	270	459	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 459 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
514	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/1)	Usarli Khurd	486A	360	461	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 461A has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
515	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/2)	Usarli Khurd	486A	342			
516	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/3)	Usarli Khurd	486A	342			
517	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/4)	Usarli Khurd	486A	342			
518	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/5)	Usarli Khurd	486A	342			
519	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/6)	Usarli Khurd	486A	342			
520	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/7)	Usarli Khurd	486A	304			
521	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/8)	Usarli Khurd	486A	323			
522	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/9)	Usarli Khurd	486A	461			
523	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/10)	Usarli Khurd	486A	319			
524	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/11)	Usarli Khurd	486A	461			
525	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/12)	Usarli Khurd	486A	376			
526	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/13)	Usarli Khurd	486A	426			
527	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/14)	Usarli Khurd	486A	510			
528	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/15)	Usarli Khurd	486A	510			



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
529	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/16)	Usarli Khurd	486A	442			
530	M/s Aashirvad Developers through Pro. Jagannath Vasant Deshpande	Class I	(167/17)	Usarli Khurd	486A	684			
531	Jujar M Ali Panvelwala, Joher M Vohra, Saifuddin M Vohra, Idris M Vohra, Ammar M Vohra	Class I	(167/18)	Usarli Khurd	486A	1630			
532	Kamalabai T Bhagat, Sugandha M Govari, Jaidas T Bhagat, Parshuram T Bhagat	Class II	(155/0)	Usarli Khurd	507	1,600	462	Shri. Parshuram Bhagat submitted a representation dated 08/08/23. Submission: - 1.) They requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 2.) 2.50 FSI 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) Their residence house exists in the original survey no. 155 and therefore they shall be granted the final plot therein. 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-7, 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-7. 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 requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 462 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
533	Shilpa P. Jadhav	Class I	(112/A)	Usarli Khurd	483	1,550	464	Shri. Narendra Jadhav submitted a representation dated 11/08/23 Submission: - 1) Sub-divisional officer, Panvel wide order dated 17/06/93, had granted NA permission for godown and poultry farming in 1000 sq.mt. land in their land bearing survey no. 112 A & B 2) They requested to delete their original land from TPS - 7.	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.
534	Shilpa P. Jadhav	Class I	(112/B)	Usarli Khurd	484	1,000			
535	Mohmmad R Bohri, Akbar R. Bohari	Class I	(117(P)/0)	Usarli Khurd	489	530	465	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 465 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
536	Mohmmad R Bohri, Akbar R. Bohari	Class I	(160/1)	Usarli Khurd	523	50			
537	Girish V Dethiya, Mayur R Satara	Class I	(124(P)/1A(P))	Usarli Khurd	496	545	466	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 466 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
538	M/s Prime Developers Pvt. Ltd. , M/s Prime Infracon Pvt. Ltd.	Class I	(113/0)	Usarli Khurd	485	11,940	467	Their representation is mentioned in FP no. 24, 129.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 467 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
539	Maruti D. Gaikawad, Santosh D. Gaikawad ,Kamla D. Gaikawad, Anna Nama Gaikawad , Vishnu Nama Gaikawad	Class I	(63(P)/1(P))	Vichumb e	172	16,465	468	Adv Paresch Gaikwad submitted their representation on 05/10/2023 but did not appear for the hearing. Submission in representation- 1) CIDCO's proposal to use 60 % of their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them is unacceptable. 2) They are cultivating their land for many years and have farm house in Gut no. 63/2. Therefore requested to retain their land for agriculture purpose only.	As per updated 7/12 extract, the total area of the Gat no 63/1, 63/2, 63/3/1, 63/3/2, 63/4/1 and 63/4/2, excluding the land under Panvel Bypass, is 17090 sqm. Out of that, 1268 sqm. is included in TP Scheme no 5 and accordingly 15822 sqm. remains inTPS-7. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 468 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
540	Ramesh Goma Gayakwad, Gunabai goma Gayakwad, Kalpana Goma Gayakwad, Vandana Goma Gayakwad, Subhash Govind Gayakwad, Krushnabai govind Gayakwad, Lila Eknath Gayakwad, Pramila Vinay Gayakwad, chhaya Prakash Gayakwad, Sundara Dattu Gayakwad, Prashant Dattu Gayakwad, Suhasini Balkrushna Gayakwad, Asmita Dattu Gayakwad, Priyanka Dattu Gayakwad, Gita Ganesh Gade, Viki Ganesh Gade, Diksha Ganesh Gade, Aparna Siddhartha Sonawane, Ashwini Anil Babare, Rupesh Keshav Gayakwad, Paresch Keshav Gayakwad,	Class I	(63(P)/2(P))	Vichumb e	173	-			
541	Vaibhav Eknath Dhudhe	Class I	(63(P)/3/1(P))	Vichumb e	174	-			
542	Vatsalabai R. urfa Raghunath Gaikawad, Rajesh Raghunath Gaikawad, Sujata Raghunath Gaikawad, Vijay Raghunath Gaikawad	Class I	(63(P)/4/1(P))	Vichumb e	176	-			
543	Madhu Vijay Agrawal, Vijay N. Agrawal	Class I	(63(P)/3/2(P))	Vichumb e	175	-			
544	Madhu Vijay Agrawal, Vijay N. Agrawal	Class I	(63(P)/4/2(P))	Vichumb e	177	-			
545	Gopal H Chiklekar, Govind H Chiklekar, Baliram H Chiklekar, Janardhan H Chiklekar, Narayan H Chiklekar	Class II	(110/1)	Usarli Khurd	478	2,960	470	They submitted a representation. Submission: - 1) They have not accepted the allotted final plot no. 470. 2) NAINA TPS is not accepted by them 3) Structures were already constructed in their land before the launch of the NAINA project.	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.
546	Janardan D. Mhatre, Jaydas D. Mhatre	Class I	(60/0)	Vichumb e	167	5,990	471	They submitted representation dated 02.08.2023. Submission: 1) As per CIDCO's notification dated 21/10/2022, the decision to use 60 % of	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 471 as shown in plan No. 4, has been



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								their original land by CIDCO and allot the remaining 40% of land to them and levy of contribution amount is not acceptable. 2) Accordingly they requested to exclude their original land from said TPS-7.	allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
547	Vasudev T. Mali, Sachin Vasudev Mali, Rajesh Vasudev Mali	Class I	(86/1)	Vichumb e	199	7,590	475	Sachin Mali and Rajesh Mali appeared for the hearing on 11/08/23 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 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) After the demise of their father, Shri Vasudev Mali, his heirs namely 1. Sachin Mali. 2. Rajesh Mali, 3. Varsha Patil were included in the ownership record of their original land-bearing survey no. 86/1 & 2. Accordingly requested to change ownership of final plot no. 475.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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 requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 475 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area and ownership as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
548	Vasudev T. Mali, Sachin Vasudev Mali, Rajesh Vasudev Mali	Class I	(86/2)	Vichumb e	200	530			
549	Shailesh C. Deshpande	Class I	(54/1E)	Vichumb e	156	1,890	476	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 476 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
550	Shailesh C. Deshpande	Class I	(54/2C/1)	Vichumb e	159	3,550			
551	Shailesh C. Deshpande	Class I	(20(P)/0)	Vichumb e	106	14,240			
552	Shailesh C. Deshpande	Class I	(26/0)	Vichumb e	111	3,260			
553	Shailesh C. Deshpande	Class I	(30/0)	Vichumb e	116	2,280			
554	Shailesh C. Deshpande	Class I	(40/0)	Vichumb e	132	1,740			
555	Shailesh C. Deshpande	Class I	(65/0)	Vichumb e	181	2,380			
556	Ghanshyam S Vaishnav, Sharda G Vaishnav, Pooja G Vaishnav, Aarti G Vaishnav, Royia G Vaishnav, Ravish G Vaishnav	Class I	(123/45/2/1/B)	Kolkhe	681	1,700	477	Dr. Suhas Haldipurkar and Dr. Ghansham Vaishnav submitted a representation. Submission: - 1) They are having plots no. 123/45/2/1 in village Kolakhe and against that	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 477 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								they have got final plots no. in TPS 7 as 477, 418, 480, 483, 485, 486 & 487. 2) Since the plots are from the same layout passed in 1991 from Collector, Alibaug, they requested to join their final plots together with other plots.	shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
557	Suhas S Haldipurkar	Class I	(123/45/2/1/C)	Kolkhe	682	1,740	478		The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 478 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
558	Dilip Kumar Shivprasad Mishra, Rajendra Shivprasad Mishra, Rajkumar Shivprasad Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/4)	Kolkhe	666	334	480	They 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.
559	Dilip Kumar Shivprasad Mishra, Rajendra Shivprasad Mishra, Rajkumar Shivprasad Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/5)	Kolkhe	667	450			
560	Dilip Kumar Shivprasad Mishra, Rajendra Shivprasad Mishra, Rajkumar Shivprasad Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/6)	Kolkhe	668	780			
561	Dilip Kumar Shivprasad Mishra, Rajendra Shivprasad Mishra, Rajkumar Shivprasad Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/7)	Kolkhe	669	430			
562	Dilip Kumar Shivprasad Mishra, Rajendra Shivprasad Mishra, Rajkumar Shivprasad Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/8)	Kolkhe	670	388			
563	Dilip Kumar Shivprasad Mishra, Rajendra Shivprasad Mishra, Rajkumar Shivprasad Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/9)	Kolkhe	671	361			
564	Janadran B. Mhatre	Class I	(88/0)	Vichumb e	202	4,550	482	They submitted their representation but did not appear for the hearing. 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 not acceptable to them. 2) 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-7	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 494 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
565	Vijaykumar S Mishra, Dilipkumar S Mishra, Rajkumar S Mishra, Rajendra Shivprasad Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/17)	Kolkhe	679	1,120	483	They 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



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7		Decision of Arbitrator	
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7		Decision of Arbitrator	
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7		8	
566	Vijaykumar S Mishra, Dilipkumar S Mishra, Rajkumar S Mishra,, Rajendra Shivprasad Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/18)	Kolkhe	680	1,819				allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.	
567	Apoorva D Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/1)	Kolkhe	662	392	484	They 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. 484 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.	
568	Amol Arvind Kothari, Nilam Arvind Kothari	Class I	(123/45/2/2/2)	Kolkhe	663	390	485	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.		The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 485 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.	
569	Vatsala arvind Kothari, Arvind G. Kothari	Class I	(123/45/2/2/3)	Kolkhe	664	385	486	They 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.	
570	Vijaykumar S Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/10)	Kolkhe	672	477	487	They submitted an objection dated 11/08/23. Submission- 1) The collector, Alibaug had already granted NA permission in their original land in 1991 and therefore it is not necessary to create new plots under the NAINA scheme. 2) Proposed charges for 2.5 FSI shall be canceled.		Draft Town Planning Scheme no. 7 has been proposed and sanctioned under the provisions of the MR & TP Act, 1966. The objection regarding the contribution amount will be decided in the final scheme. The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 487, as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.	
571	Vijaykumar S Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/11)	Kolkhe	673	493					
572	Vijaykumar S Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/12)	Kolkhe	674	350					
573	Vijaykumar S Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/13)	Kolkhe	675	433					
574	Vijaykumar S Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/14)	Kolkhe	676	857					
575	Vijaykumar S Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/15)	Kolkhe	677	899					
576	Vijaykumar S Mishra	Class I	(123/45/2/2/16)	Kolkhe	678	858					
577	Jijabai Gurunath Keni, Kashinath Changa Bhingarkar, Lakshmbai Changa Bhingarkar, Anubai Bama Mhatre, Anjirabai Lakshman bhoir, Jaymala Changa Bhingarkar, Pramila Devidas bhoir, Lata Ramesh bhoir, Indubai Bhagwan Phadke, Asha Sagar Koli, Santoshi Vikram Mehara, Vandana Santosh Bhagat	Class II	(64(P)/1(P))	Vichumb e	180	1,200	488	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.		The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 488 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.	
578	Ragho P. Bhagat	Class I	(158/2)	Usarli Khurd	512	200	491	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.		By considering the different classes of land, Final Plot no 491 in the sanctioned Draft scheme has been subdivided and Final Plot No. 491 has been allotted for Gut No. 158/4 and Final Plot No. 492 has been allotted for Gut No. 158/2.	
579	Ragho P. Bhagat	Class I	(158/4)	Usarli Khurd		1,040					



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									Final Plot No. 491 & 492, as shown in plan No. 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
580	Shashikala R Devkar, Sunny R Devkar	Class I	(122(P)/8(P))	Usarli Khurd	495	1,699	492	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The part area of Gut No. 122, Usarli Khurd is affected by the railway acquisition and the remaining area is out of the TPS-7 scheme. Accordingly, the original land bearing Gut No. 122/8 pt is not eligible for the Final plot, and therefore Final plot no. 492 proposed for the original land in the sanctioned Draft scheme is cancelled.
581	Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra, Tahir A Panvelwala	Class I	(123/2/1/B)	Kolkhe	650	2,350	493	They 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.
582	Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra, Tahir A Panvelwala	Class I	(123/A/1/B)	Kolkhe	651	1,540			
583	Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra, Tahir A Panvelwala	Class I	(123/A/2/B)	Kolkhe	652	1,420			
584	Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra, Tahir A Panvelwala	Class I	(123/A/45/1/B)	Kolkhe	683	1,250			
585	Madhuri P. Vijapurkar, Avinash L Karkre, Prashant L Karkare, Ashwini A Deulkar, Jyoti P Moghe, Vijay Shriram Padhye, Nirmala Padhye, Smita Vyas, Shital Karkare, Sampda S Karkare, Samrudhi S Karkare, Girish H Gujir, Sndhya S Prabhudesai, Aniruddh S Kokil, Sonal S Kokil, Minal P Gokhale, Parshuram Hshya urf Hasharam Surte	Class I	(123/A/4/B)	Kolkhe	655	1,240	495	They 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.
586	Mohanbhai N Bhimani, Devshi N Bhimani (Urf patel)	Class I	(123/12/A/6)	Kolkhe	661	7,416	499	They submitted a representation dated 17/08/2023. Submission: - 1) They own land bearing old survey no. 123/16/plot no1 (New survey no. 34/A/16/1) - Area 1277 sq.mt. and old survey no. 123/12/A/6 (New survey no. 34/12/A/6)- Area- 2170 sq.mt. in Kolkhe village. 2) In TPS-7 they have been granted final plot no. 499, but it is not acceptable to them as their land does not fall in TPS-7	As per their request and the copies of their sanctioned permission plans, it is seen that their lands bearing no. 123A/16/1 and 123/12/A/6 are not included in TPS-7 and the final plot proposed to them in sanctioned draft Scheme is cancelled. The said final plot no. 499A has been allotted to SPA, NAINA, so that it can be granted for the land for which the final plot has not been granted. In case of any claim for final plots against the said original lands and any other original lands in the said scheme, SPA- NAINA shall verify the authenticity & location of the original lands in TPS-7 boundary

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									and confirm that the final plot has not been granted against it and then carved out final plot to the tune of 40% of the area of the original land from said FP No. 499A and allot it to the concerned land owners. The remaining unclaimed land shall be used as sell plot.
587	Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra, Tahir A Panvelwala	Class I	(119/A/1/1)	Kolkhe	628	49,471	501, 505	Mr. Taher Panvelwala, Mr. Shabbir Vohra, Mr. Mustafa Vohra, Mr. Murtaza Vohra, Mr. Aliasger Vohra, and Mr. Mohammed Vohra submitted an objection dated 17/08/23. Submission:- 1) They are owners of NA land bearing survey no. 119/A/1/1, Area- 49471 sq.mt at village Kolkhe and they have been allotted final plots no. 501 & 505, measuring 19788 sq. mt. 2) They submitted that 49471 sq. mt land is required to be allotted with full FSI. 3) Demand of contribution amount is illegal and they are not liable to pay the same.	In Special Civil Suit No. 235 of 2015, consent terms were filed by the parties and accordingly, Hon. Court passed a decree dated 15.07.2015. As per the decree, 1) The plaintiff (Saifuddin M. Vohra, Ammar M. Vohra, Juzer Panvelwala, Johar M. Vohra, & Idris M. Vohra) became the owner of Survey No. 119/B/1 and 119/B/2 of Kolkhe village. 2) The Respondent (Taher A. Panvelwala, Shabbir A. Vohra, Mustafa A. Vohra, Murtaza A. Vohra, Aliasger A. Vohra, and Mohammed A. Vohra) became the owner of Survey No. 119/A/1/1, 119/A/2, 119/B/3, 4,5,6,8, 119/C, D, E, F, G, H, 120. They requested to grant a separate final plot as per their division.
588	Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra, Tahir A Panvelwala	Class I	(119/A/2)	Kolkhe	630	3,090			
589	Jujar M Ali Panvelwala, Joher M Vohra, Saifuddin M Vohra, Idris M Vohra, Ammar M Vohra	Class I	(119/B/1)	Kolkhe	631	23,347	502, 503	Legale Affaires, Advocate & Notary submitted an objection dated 17/08/2023 on behalf of their client Mr. Taher Panvelwala, Mr. Shabbir Vohra, Mr. Mustafa Vohra, Mr. Murtaza Vohra, Mr. Aliasger Vohra and Mr. Mohammed Vohra. Submission:- 1) In pursuance of a decree dated 15/07/2015 in Special civil suit no. 235/2015, their client became the owner of NA land along with a structure standing thereon bearing survey no. 119/B/3, 4, 5, 6, 8; 119/C, D,E,F, G,H;120/0 at village Kolkhe. and their names were duly mutated in the 7/12 extract of the said property. 2) As per Gazette dated 25/04/22 and notice dated 21/07/23 under rule 13(3), their client have been allotted final plot no 502 & 503 which is collective allotment for 119/B/1,2,3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8; 119/C, D,E,F, G,H;120/0. They requested to grant independent plots in lieu of land at survey nos. 119/B/3, 4, 5, 6, 8; 119/C, D, E, F, G, H;120/0 3) The said property is NA land and falls in 200 mt of Kolkhe village and hence 100% area allotment and full FSI benefit	Accordingly, The layout of the scheme has been revised, and because of this following revised reconstituted Final Plots have been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B. 1. New Gut No. 30/B/1 & 30/B/2- Final Plot No. 502 2. New Gut No. 30/B/7 - Final Plot No. 503 3. New Gut No. 30/A/1/1, 30/A/2, 30/B/3, 4,5,6,8, 30/C, D, E, F, G, H, 120 - Final Plot No. 505A & 505B.
590	Jujar M Ali Panvelwala, Joher M Vohra, Saifuddin M Vohra, Idris M Vohra, Ammar M Vohra	Class I	(119/B/2)	Kolkhe	632				
591	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(119/B/3)	Kolkhe	633				
592	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(119/B/4)	Kolkhe	634				
593	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(119/B/5)	Kolkhe	635				
594	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(119/B/6)	Kolkhe	636				
595	Saifhuddin (Saifi) Mohammad Ali Vohra	Class I	(119/B/7)	Kolkhe	637				



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7		Decision of Arbitrator	
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	7		8	
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6				
596	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(119/B/8)	Kolkhe	638			<p>shall be provided. 4) Demand for contribution amount is illegal and not binding upon their client.</p> <p>Legale Affaires, Advocate & Notary submitted an objection dated 17/08/2023 on behalf of their client Mr. Saifuddin Vohra.</p> <p>Submission: - 1) Their client is the owner of the survey no. 119/B/7, Area-1481 sq. mt at village Kolkhe. They constructed a G+2 storey building on the said property after getting permission from competent authority 2) As per Gazette dated 25/04/22 and notice dated 21/07/23 under rule 13(3), their client has been allotted final plot no 502 & 503 which is the collective allotment for 119/B/1,2,3, 4, 5, 6,7, 8; 119/C, D, E, F, G, H;120/0. They requested to grant independent plots in lieu of land at survey nos. 119/B/7. 3) The said property is NA land and falls in 200 mt of Kolkhe village and hence 100% area allotment and full FSI benefit shall be provided. 4) Demand for contribution amount is illegal and not binding upon their client.</p>			
597	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(119/C)	Kolkhe	639						
598	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(119/D)	Kolkhe	640						
599	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(119/E)	Kolkhe	641						
600	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(119/F)	Kolkhe	642						
601	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(119/G)	Kolkhe	643						
602	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(119/H)	Kolkhe	644			<p>Legale Affaires, Advocate & Natary submitted an objection dated 17/08/2023 on behalf of their client Mr. Idris Vohra, Saifuddin Vohra, Amar Vohra, Johar Vohra, and Juzer Panvelwala.</p> <p>Submission: - 1) Their client is the owner of the survey no. 119/B/1, 2, Area-4286 sq. mt at village Kolkhe. 2) As per Gazette dated 25/04/22 and notice dated 21/07/23 under rule 13(3), their client have been allotted final plot no 502 & 503 which is collective allotment for 119/B/1,2,3, 4, 5, 6,7, 8; 119/C, D,E,F,G,H;120/0. They requested to grant independent plots in lieu of land at survey nos. 119/B/1& 2. 3) The said property is NA land and falls in 200 mt of Kolkhe village and hence 100% area allotment and full FSI benefit shall be provided. 4) Demand for contribution amount is illegal and not binding upon their client.</p>			
603	Taher A Panvelwala, Murtaza A Vohra, Mustafa A Vohra, Mohd A Vohra, Shabbir A Vohra, Ali Asghar A Vohra	Class I	(120/0)	Kolkhe	645	228					




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
604	Aso Standard Infro Period Mumbai	Class I	(121/1)	Kolkhe	646	7,952	504	Dy General Manager, HPCL submitted a representation dated 05/09/23. Submission: - 1) HPCL is the present owner of land bearing survey no. 121/0, measuring 13037 sq. yards. The present 7/12 extract stands in the name of Esso Standard Eastern Inc., the said land has been in possession of HPCL since 1974 and HPCL is the legal and rightful owner of the said plot.3) The Authority has amalgamated original plot no. 646, 647 & 648 and allotted a single final plot no. 504 having an area of 7150 sq. mt. 4) They requested to allot them a separate plot at the same location and objected to the demand of a contribution amount of Rs 6.02 crore.	As per their request, the proposed final plot no. 504 in the draft-sanctioned scheme has been subdivided and final plot no. 504A has been allotted to Gut no. 32/2A, 2B, and final plot no. 504B has been allotted to Gut No. 32/1.
605	AP Khalid Mo. Malbari, AP Azeez M Malbari, AP Jalil M, AP Mustafa M Malbari, AP Zubair M Malbari	Class I	(121/2A)	Kolkhe	647	-		A.P. Zubair Malbari submitted an objection dated 23/08/23. Submission: - 1) They submitted an objection in respect of survey no. 32/2/A and 32/2/B, Area-3069 and 2611 sq. mt respectively. 2) They obtained NA cum construction permission dated 22/03/79 from the collector, Raigad, and carried out construction activity. 3) They requested to allot the final plot in such a manner where the existing structure shall not hamper, they are running the restaurant business since more than 50 years. 4) Final plot no 504 is allotted to them wherein the eligible area of the owner of the survey no. 32/1 is also included. They requested to allot a separate final plot belonging to their eligible area.	The layout of the scheme has been revised and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 504A, and 504B have been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
606	AP Zohra M Malbari, AP Rehmat M Malbari, AP Mumtaz M Malbari, AP Shehnaz M Malbari, AP Khalid M Malbari, AP Azeez M Malbari, AP Jalil M Malbari, AP Mustafa M Malbari, AP Jubair M Malbari, AP Khatija M Malbari, AP Zubila M Malbari	Class I	(121/2B)	Kolkhe	648	-			
607	Arunkumar M Thakkar	Class I	(105/1A)	Kolkhe	574	2,416	506	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 506 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
608	Mahasanchalak Butal Parivahan Mantralaya, Bharat Sarkar New delhi	Class I	(108/2B)	Kolkhe	583	474	507	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 507 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
609	Kavaldip J Kohli, Phirozlal S Pillai, Sajid S Pilli, Saynababivi S Pillai	Class I	(108/1)	Kolkhe	584	-			
610	Ekta S Khosla, Sanyunka P Rajput, Vinayak P Rajput, Mukesh G Rajput, Sunil G Rajput	Class I	(108/2)	Kolkhe	585	-			




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
611	Shriniwas N Padhye	Class I	(106/0)	Kolkhe	581	627	508	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 508 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
612	Sadak Parivahan & Rajyamarg Mantralaya	Class I	(106/2)	Kolkhe	582	-			
613	Shriniwas Narayan Padhye, Nanajibhai Shah, Aziz Ismail Dhariwala, Ismail Ibrahim Dhariwala, Kawal Kohli, Ekta S. Khosla, Vinayak P. Rajput, Sayunkta P. Rajput	Class I	(105/B/4/5/6/7/1)	Kolkhe	578	2,280	509	Mr. Nirmal Kumar Shah and Pankaj Shah submitted their representation on 14/09/2023. Submission in representation- 1) They requested to allot 100% of the original land as Final plot. 2) They requested that the final plot location shall be as per existing location whereas CIDCO NAINA has given final plot on different location.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 509 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
614	Maruti D. Gaikawad, Santosh D. Gaikawad, Kamla D. Gaikawad, Anna Nama Gaikawad, Vishnu Nama Gaikawad	Class I	(61/1)	Vichumb e	168	2,500	511	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 511 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
615	Maruti D. Gaikawad, Santosh D. Gaikawad, Kamla D. Gaikawad, Anna Nama Gaikawad, Vishnu Nama Gaikawad	Class I	(80/1)	Vichumb e	192	4,000			
616	Swati Devendra Patil, Damini Sawalaram Bhoir, Monika Harindra Gondhali, Sugandha Sawalaram Bhoir, Nikesh Sawalaram Bhoir, M. C. Sunny, National builders behalf partner Sijo Sunny	Class I	(54/2B)	Vichumb e	158	9,800	512, 519	Shri Sijo Sunny appeared for the hearing on 08/08/2023. Submission in hearing- 1.) They have been granted final plots no. 512 & 519, which are separated by a 15 mt. wide road, and therefore requested to grant a single final plot. 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-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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 Plots No. 512 & 519 as shown in plan No. 4, have been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
617	Bharat K Shah	Class I	(105/3B/1)	Kolkhe	575	1,156	513	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									7. 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. 513 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
618	Mohmmad M Mahmmad Siddhiki, Shrirajulahak S. Siddhiki, Akbarhusain S Siddhiki, Mohmmad F Siddhiki, Sajra Khatun Rajbul husain chaudhari, Shamshadhusain rajbul husain chaudhari & 7 others	Class I	(105/B/4/5/6/7/2)	Kolkhe	579	3,160	514	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 514 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
619	Nirmalkumar N Shah	Class I	(105/3B/2)	Kolkhe	576	657	515	Mr. Nirmal Kumar Shah and Pankaj Shah submitted their representation on 14/09/2023. Submission in representation- 1) They requested to allot 100% of the original land as Final plot. 2) They requested that the final plot location shall be as per existing location whereas CIDCO NAINA has given final plot on different location.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 515 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
620	Sayanbabivi S Pillai, Firozlal S Pillai, Sajid S. Pillai	Class I	(105/3B/3)	Kolkhe	577	816	516	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 516 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
621	Abhijit Singh Surjit Singh, Harnit kaur Surjit singh Kohli, Paldip kaur Jasprit singh Chandok, Parmit kaur Surjit Singh Kohli, Pretesh kaur Sanrmit singh Kolhi, Gurvinder kaur Surjit singh Kohli	Class I	(105/2A)	Kolkhe	580	2,530	518	They submitted an objection dated 14/08/2023. Submission:- Town planning scheme prepared for their land and allotted final plot in the scheme are not accepted by them	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 518 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
622	Vinay J Bansal	Class I	(109/8A/2)	Kolkhe	597	4,480	520	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 520 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
623	Hari J Varchand, Visanji V Chadva	Class I	(109/8A/1)	Kolkhe	596	730	521	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
624	Bhavna P Risbood, Manoj P Gurjar (urf padhye)	Class I	(114/0)	Kolkhe	622	1,060	522	Shri. Manoj Gurjar alias Padhya submitted a representation dated 17/08/2023. Submission:- 1) There are many fruit-bearing trees in their original land and its compensation for acquisition is not mentioned in the notice.2) His sister Smt. Bhavana Risbood has relinquished her rights in his favor by registered release deed no. 9893/2021. 3) In lieu of the acquisition of their land they are getting only 40% plot and they have to pay 30.89 lakh, therefore they objected to the said acquisition.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to the change in the owners' name as per the 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.
625	Aatmaram R. Bhoir	Class II	(66(P)/0)	Vichumb e	182	3,234	523	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 523 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
626	Jagdishkumar R Bansal	Class I	(109(P)/6B(P))	Kolkhe	593	6,586	524	Shri. Jagdish Bansal submitted an objection dated 06/09/2023. Submission: - 1) The land owners have surrendered 60% of their ownership lands to CIDCO, only 30% of the land will be required by CIDCO for the development of roads and other infrastructure, and the balance 30% has been designated for Growth Centre which will be monetized by CIDCO. In addition, CIDCO will also be charging Development charges.2) They strongly object to applying the said scheme so far as their property is concerned, as it has been NA property since 1990.	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 524 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
627	Jagdishkumar R Bansal	Class I	(109(P)/6C(P))	Kolkhe	594	-			
628	Jagdishkumar R Bansal	Class I	(109/7)	Kolkhe	595	2,810			
629	Jagdishkumar R Bansal	Class I	(109/8B)	Kolkhe	598	990			
630	Jomi Vilas Bhoir, Rajeshri Mahendra Gavand, Shyam Vilas Bhoir, Surekha Vilas Bhoir	Class I	(54/2C/2)	Vichumb e	160	3,000	525	They submitted a representation dated 17/08/2023. Submission - 1) After the demise of their father, Vilas Bhoir, the said original land bearing 54/2/c is now owned by Shri. Jomi Bhoir and 4 others. 2) They have been allotted final plot no 525 in Kolkhe in lieu of their land in Vichumb e. They have existing structure in their original land and requested to grant Final plot adjoining to FP no. 106. 3.) They requested to grant the final plot of a minimum of 60% area of their original land. 4) 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. 5) The contribution amount as per form	Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, 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-7. 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 requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 129C has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								no. 1 is not accepted and shall be waived. 6) 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.	
631	Parsian Agro Hot Ent. Pvt. Ltd. through director Dinesh Jain, Yogesh P. Thakkar	Class I	(109(P)/6A(P))	Kolkhe	592	20,590	527	Shri. Salim Qureshi and other 5 submitted presentation dated 09/10/2023. Submission- 1) The original land was sold by their father to M/s Parsian Enterprises, however wide registered sale deed dated 01/12/2006, the possession of 1300 sq.mt land was not granted to them and it remained in the occupation of their father.2) They have filed suit no. 347/2023 in Panvel court. 3) Accordingly they requested to grant them final plot in proportion of their 1300 sq.mt land.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
632	Soniya Sud, Rahul Sud, Laksh Sud, brig Mohini, Shivkumar Ramdas Sud, M/s. National builders behalf partner M. C. Sani	Class I	(54/1D)	Vichumb e	155	14,400	528	Shri. Harilal Patel submitted presentation dated 03/10/2023 Submission- 1) vide sale deed dated 29/12/2020 they purchased plot bearing survey no. 54/1/D, 11700 sq.mt. from M/s National Builders and it was transferred in his name in 7/12 extract. 2) Accordingly requested to grant them separate final plot for their area.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed, subject to the change in the owner's name as per the updated 7/12 extract. 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.
633	Kamalakar Padu Bhoir, Sanjay kanu Bhoir, Chandrakant Kanu Bhoir, Radhabai Sharad Bhingarkar	Class II	(81/0)	Vichumb e	194	6,200	529, 535	They submitted a representation dated - /09/2023. Submission - 1.) They have not accepted the location of the Final Plot in the sanctioned draft TPS and requested to grant the final plot in Vichumbe village only. 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.5) Shri. Kamalakar Bhoir & others, wide registered Gift deed dated 09/10/20, had gifted 3200 sq. mt. land out of Gut no. 82 to Shri Pandurang Bhoir, Sudesh Bhoir, Mayur Bhoir, and Nana Bhoir.	In the sanctioned development plan of NAINA, their original land bearing Gut no. 54 of village Vichumbe is under the reservation of Growth Centre and therefore they have been granted the final plot at another location in the same village fronting on 12.0 mt. wide layout road. Considering the area of reservations and amenities in TPS-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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.
634	Kamalakar Padu Bhoir, Sanjay kanu Bhoir, Chandrakant Kanu Bhoir, Radhabai Sharad Bhingarkar, Ganesh Valaku Bhoir, Nana Valaku Bhoir, Pandurang Valaku Bhoir, Mayur Minunath Bhoir, Sudesh Mahadu Bhoir	Class II	(82/0)	Vichumb e	195	6,170			As per the updated 7/12 extract, separate Final Plot No. 529 has been allotted to Gut No. 81/0 and Final Plot No. 535A has been allotted to Gut No. 82/0. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plots no. 529 & 535A have been allotted for their original plot with correction in the



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07								Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.		
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
									area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
635	Sharifabi H Kureshi, Salim H Kureshi, Nisar H Kureshi, Ajit H Kureshi, Aayub H Kureshi, Riyaz H Kureshi	Class II	(109/4B)	Kolkhe	590	5,580	530	Shri Ajit Kureshi appeared for the hearing on 18/08/2023. 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-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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 requirements, and in view of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 530 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
636	Hari J Varchand, Visanji V Chadva	Class I	(109/4A)	Kolkhe	589	2,310	531	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	By considering the same ownership, the proposed final plot no. 531 & 536 are clubbed together. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 536 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
637	Ismail E Dhariwala	Class I	(109/5)	Kolkhe	591	2,380	532	Adv Umesh Shinde, on behalf of Ebrahim Esmile Dhariwal and Aziz Esmile Dhariwal, submitted representation. Submission:- They are legal owners of old survey no. 109/5, 118/2, 110/3/4, 3/5, 3/5, and 110/2, and in lieu of that they have been granted final plot no 532, 552, 533, and 559, total area 4483 sq. mt. They requested to grant a single entire plot around 4483 sq. mt. in the same locality.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 532 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
638	Ismail E Dhariwala	Class I	(110/3/3)	Kolkhe	616	403	533		The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 533 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
639	Ismail E Dhariwala	Class I	(110/3/4)	Kolkhe	617	286			
640	Ismail E Dhariwala	Class I	(110/3/5)	Kolkhe	618	861			
641	Warior Foundation Through trusty AS Madhvan	Class I	(110/3/1)	Kolkhe	614	585	534	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 534 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
642	Warior Foundation Through trusty AS Madhvan	Class I	(110/3/2)	Kolkhe	615	445			
643	Hari J Varchand, Visanji V Chadva	Class I	(109/1)	Kolkhe	586	5,970	536	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	By considering the same ownership, the proposed final plot no. 531 & 536 are clubbed together. The layout of the scheme has been revised for planning requirements, and because of this revised
644	Hari J Varchand, Visanji V Chadva	Class I	(109/2)	Kolkhe	587	6,780			
645	Hari J Varchand, Visanji V Chadva	Class I	(109/3)	Kolkhe	588	4,550			
646	Hari J Varchand, Visanji V Chadva	Class I	(109/9)	Kolkhe	599	3,490			

Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
647	Hari J Varchand, Visanji V Chadva	Class I	(109/10)	Kolkhe	600	3,590			reconstituted Final Plot no. 536 has been allotted for their original plot with correction in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
648	V S Kurup Shilpshri Darshan Co.Ho.Sco. Pvt. Ltd. through Treasurer	Class I	(110/1/1)	Kolkhe	601	358	537	They 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	Raigad Co. Ho. Sco.	Class I	(110/1/2)	Kolkhe	602	856	538	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 538 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
650	Rita Mohan	Class I	(110/1/3)	Kolkhe	603	435	539	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
651	Jasvirsingh S Kohli	Class I	(110/1/12)	Kolkhe	612	435	540	They 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.
652	Jankalyan Sevagram through director P S Rajgopalan	Class I	(110/1/11)	Kolkhe	611	435	541	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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	Jankalyan Sevagram through Director P S Rajgopalan	Class I	(110/1/10)	Kolkhe	610	435	542	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 542 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
654	M/s Premium Construction through partners Chandrashekhar A Palande	Class I	(110/1/9)	Kolkhe	609	435	543	They 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.
655	Aftaab Alam Mohammad Shalif	Class I	(110/1/3)	Kolkhe	603	346	545	They 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.
656	Jubair Abdul Sheikh	Class I	(110/1/4)	Kolkhe	604	346	546	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 546 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
657	Tabssum Jubair Shekh	Class I	(110/1/5)	Kolkhe	605	368	547	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.




Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
658	Maaldar Construction Through Salauddin M Khan	Class I	(110/1/6)	Kolkhe	606	326	548	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 548 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
659	Maaldar Construction Through Salauddin M Khan	Class I	(110/1/7)	Kolkhe	607	338	549	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
660	Latif Begam M Kureshi	Class I	(110/1/8)	Kolkhe	608	342	550	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 550 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
661	Ismail E Dhariwala	Class I	(118/2)	Kolkhe	627	2,220	552	Adv Umesh Shinde, on behalf of Ebrahim Esmile Dhariwal and Aziz Esmile Dhariwal, submitted a representation. Submission in representation:- They are legal owners of old survey no. 109/5, 118/2, 110/3/4, 3/5, 3/5, and 110/2 and in lieu of that they have been granted final plot no 532, 552, 533, and 559, total area 4483 sq. mt. They requested to grant a single entire plot around 4483 sq. mt. in the same locality.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
662	Shriniwas V Gurjar, Vidya S Acharya, Surekha S Bhagwat, Chandrakant R Gurjar, Suryakant R Gurjar, Anjali P Kulkarni, Shubhangi A Gurjar, Prasad A Gurjar, Jayashree V Joshi, Vasumati S Gurjar, Satish S Gurjar, Suvarna S Pawar, Anagha C Adkar, Mangala M Gurjar, Prashant M Gurjar, Seema V Devasthali, Narayan G Gurjar, Yashwant G Gurjar, Purshottam P Gurjar, Prabhakar G Gurjar, Sudhakar G Gurjar, Kamal R Sapre, Kusum S Desai, Malti R Pimparkar, Nalini S Bhagwat, Alka K Konkar	Class I	(117/0)	Kolkhe	625	101	554	They appeared for a hearing on 25/09/2023. 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-7, the request to grant the final plot of a minimum of 100% of the original land can not be considered. Regarding FSI and TDR provisions, the regulations are already proposed in SDCR for TPS-7. 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. 554 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
663	Shriniwas N Padhye, Sadanand N Padhye, Sudhar N Padhye, Balkrushna M Padhye, Jaganath M Padhye, Shyamkant M Padhye, Ramakant M Padhye, Shrikant M Padhye, Susheela V Pandit, Sumati A Paradkar, Kalpana M Sandu, Vasudha V Kirloskar, Smita S Kulkarni, Suhasini S Sohni, Raghunath V Padhye, Vishvanath S Padhye, Shrikrushna R Sandu, Dattatray S Paradkar, Madhusudhan S Paradkar, Mukund S Paradkar, Mohan S Paradkar, Kamal V Ambedkar, Mira M Joshi, Urmila B Halbe, Radhika R Devasthale, Preeti P Paradkar, Pranav P Paradkar, Pratik P Paradkar, Bhavna P Risbood, Manoj P Gurjar (Urf Padhye)	Class I	(115/0)	Kolkhe	623	100	555	Shri. Dilip Gurjar and shri. Pradip Gurjar submitted a representation dated 22/08/2023. Submission: - In the letter dated 24/07/23, survey no. 115 & 118 are mentioned. However, Kolkhe village has been subdivided into new Kolkhae Peth village and new survey nos 26 & 29. Accordingly, they requested to issue fresh notice as per new survey nos.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
664	Shriniwas N Padhye, Sadanand N Padhye, Sudhar N Padhye, Nirmal L Jawdekar, Sheila L Totade, Shakuntala G Olkar, Shyamla S Prabhu, Anjali A Joshi, Bhavna P Risbud, Manoj P Gurjar (urf padhye)	Class I	(112/0)	Kolkhe	620	126	556	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
665	Sadanand Narayan Padhye	Class I	(116/0)	Kolkhe	624	130	557	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. 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.
666	Shashikant V Gurjar - Padhye, Subhada D Bhadamkar	Class I	(118/1)	Kolkhe	626	1,190	558	Shri. Dilip Gurjar and shri. Pradip Gurjar submitted a representation dated 22/08/2023. Submission:- In the letter dated 24/07/23, survey no. 115 & 118 are mentioned. However, Kolkhe village has been subdivided into new Kolkhae Peth village and new survey nos 26 & 29. Accordingly, they requested to issue fresh notice as per new survey nos. Shri. Vinayak Rajput and others have submitted presentation dated 18/09/2023. Submission- They are the owner of survey no. 21/1B (old survey no. 110/1B), admeasuring 7000 sq.mt. Their land upto Tata powerline admesuring 3000 sq.mt is included in TPS-7 and marked as site no. 558, 562, & 649. 3) Accordingly they requested to grant final plot in lieu of 3000 sq.mt. Land.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 558 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
667	Ajij Ismail Dhariwala, Ibrahim Ismail Dhariwala	Class I	(110/2)	Kolkhe	627	4,960	559	Adv Umesh Shinde, on behalf of Ebrahim Esmile Dhariwal and Aziz Esmile Dhariwal, submitted representation. Submission:- They are legal owners of old survey no. 109/5, 118/2, 110/3/4, 3/5, 3/5, and 110/2 and in lieu of that they have been granted final plot no 532, 552, 533, and 559, total area 4483 sq. mt. They requested to grant a single entire plot around 4483 sq. mt. in the same locality.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 559 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
668	Sadanand Narayan Padhye	Class I	(113/0)	Kolkhe	621	330	561	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 561 as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
669	Vaishali P. Rajput, Ekta Suresh Sosla Vinayak P. Rajput, Sayunkta P. Rajput	Class I	(21/1/B(P))	Kolkhe	684	460	561A	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 561A as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.
670	M/s Prayag Riyality Tarfe Pradip Krushna Bhopi, Bhikhabhai R. Madat, Jitesh Pramod Agrawal, Kiran Madhav Nangare	Class I	(123(pt)/0)	Vichumb e	234	49	Dispos sessed	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	
671	Laxmi S Mhatre, Raju S Mhatre, Santosh Mhatre, Indumati R Patil, Anjani P Dev	Class I	(121(pt)/0)	Usarli Khurd	496	50	Dispos sessed	They neither appeared for a hearing nor submitted any representation.	
672	Mrs. Sajid Shaikh and Mr. Latif Shaikh		34/7	Kolkhe Peth	-	2050	-	Gazanfar Abdul Sattar Khan submitted a representation dated 27/06/2023. Submission in representation:- They along with Mrs. Sajid Shaikh and Mr. Latif Shaikh have agricultural land bearing old survey no. 123/7, Kolkhe (new survey no. 34/7/2 of village Kolkhe Peth.) 2) Their survey no falls in TPS 7, but they are unable to find out final plot details against their survey no. in the scheme.	The said original lands Gut no. 34/7/1 and 34/7/2, village Kolakhe Peth (old Gut No. 123/7 are included in the TPS 7, but in the sanctioned Draft Scheme, final plots are not proposed for the said lands. Therefore the layout of the scheme has been revised and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 490A has been allotted for Gut No. 34/7/1 and Final Plot No. 490B has been allotted for Gut No. 34/7/2, as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
673	Mohan Vajekar, Ramakant Vajekar, Milind Vajekar, Usha Vajekar, Ajinkya Vajekar, Swapna Mhatre.		213	Vichumb e	-	700	-	Ramakant Vajekar wide representation dated 28.08.2023 requested to give information about the final plot granted for their land bearing Gut No. 213 in Vichumbe.	In the other right column of the 7/12 extract of Gut No. 213, Vichumbe, it is stated that the land is under the road. Also as per the village map of Vichumbe, it is under the road. In the sanctioned Draft Scheme, a final plot has not been proposed for the said land. Therefore the said representation is not considered.
674	-	-	-	Kolkhe	-	-	-		It is seen from the plans and Form -2 of TPS-7 that Gut No. 123/3, 5, 6, & 10 of Kolkhe village are included in the scheme but their 7/12 extracts are



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
								-	not available and also final plots are not proposed for said Gut nos. in the Draft Sanctioned Scheme. Therefore, Final Plot no. 499B has been allotted to SPA- NAINA, so that it can be granted for the land for which the final plot has not been granted. In case of any claim for final plots against the said original lands and any other original lands in the said scheme, SPA- NAINA shall verify the authenticity & location of the original lands in TPS-7 boundary and confirm that the final plot has not been granted against it and then carved out final plot to the tune of 40% of the area of the original land from said FP No. 499B and allot it to the concerned land owners. The remaining unclaimed land shall be used as sell plot.
675	Gurucharan	Sarkar	(74(P)/0)	Vichumb e	185	5,943	22, 162, 363	Sub-Divisional Office Panvel vide letter no SDO/Land/Ka. Ta.2/Naina TPS Hearing/223 dated 10/08/2023 submitted that - The governmentm lands situated in village Devad, Usarli Khurd, Vichumbe nd Shivkar, Ta. Panvel are required for various government proposals and therefore, the said lands shall not be reserved for any purposes.	The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the tenure of the lands in the scheme as follows: A. The Gurucharan lands are combined together and Final Plots no. 22, 162A, 245, & 451 are allotted to "Government of Maharashtra". B. Some Gurcharan Lands were given to the Gram Panchayat Vichumbe by the Government on certain conditions. Accordingly Final plots no. 23, 27, 78, 69, 129 A, 99+101,162B, 239, 242, 378 are allotted to "Government of Maharashtra" and in their other rigts, it is mentioned that "Given to concerned Grampanchayat Vichumbe on certain conditions." C. Some Gurucharan lands were given to Gram Panchyat Kolkhe by the Governement of Maharashtra on certain conditions. Accordingly Final plots no 320A, 362B, 265, 323 are allotted to "Government of Maharashtra" and in the other rights it is mentioned that "Given to concerned Grampanchayat Kolkhe on certain conditions". D. For other Govt lands (Bin Akari, Govt), Final Plots No. 243, 362A, 68, 442, 450 are allotted in the name of "Government of Maharashtra".
676	Gurucharan	Sarkar	(38/0)	Vichumb e	126	1,400			
677	Gurucharan	Sarkar	(76/0)	Vichumb e	188	15,500			
678	Gurucharan	Sarkar	(78/0)	Vichumb e	190	23,022			
679	Gurucharan	Sarkar	(79/0)	Vichumb e	191	8,000			
680	Gurucharan	Sarkar	(47/0)	Vichumb e	142	2,500			
681	Gurucharan	Class I	(192/0)	Vichumb e	242	2,000			
682	Gurucharan, Group Grampanchayat Vichumbe	Sarkar	(75(pt)/0)	Vichumb e	186	75,203	23, 27, 69, 78, 99, 101, 445, 450	2) The Incharge Sarpanch and Gramsevak of Group Grampanchayat Usarli Khurd vide letter no 981/2023 dated 19/10/2023 submitted following request: A) For the original lands of Usarli Khurd/ Deravali, Gram panchayat, the final plot of at least 60% of the roiginal can bec granted. B) 2.5 FSI shall be granted on the final plot. Also, unconsumed FSI due to any restrictions shall be permitted to be transferred as TDR on any plot. C) Final plots shall be granted in the namee of Usarli Khurd, Deravali. D) Final plots no 302 and 362 are proposed on the land wherein unauthorized construction are existed. Therefore they requested to amalgamate reservation no -A. P 187, final plot no 452 and final plot no 455 on Gut no 120 and allot them final plot on the said Gut no 120 of Usarli Khurd.	
683	Maharashtra Shasan	Sarkar	(75(pt)/78(p t))	Vichumb e	187	-			
684	Gurucharan, Group Grampanchayat Kolkhe	Sarkar	(111/1/1)	Usarli Khurd	480	7,300			
685	Sarkari Bin Aakari	Sarkar	(111/1/2)	Usarli Khurd	481	300			
686	Sarkari Bin Aakari	Sarkar	(111/2)	Usarli Khurd	482	1,500			
687	Maharashtra Shasan binaakari pad	Sarkar	(157/2)	Usarli Khurd	510	4,000			
688	Gurucharan, Group Grampanchayat Vichumbe	Sarkar	(89/0)	Vichumb e	203	9,200			



Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
689	Gurucharan, Group Grampanchayat Vichumbe	Sarkar	(194/0)	Vichumb e	245	1,100	239, 242, 245		E. For Govt lands bearing Gat numbers 66/0 of Devad and 94/0 of Usarli Khurd has been allotted final plots no. 1 and 431 respectively for the crematorium, in the name of Government of Maharashtra.
690	Gurucharan Group Gram Panchayat Kolkhe	Sarkar	(82/0)	Usarli Khurd	433	800	320, 362		
691	Gurucharan Group Gram Panchayat Kolkhe	Sarkar	(95/0)	Usarli Khurd	465	6,500			
692	Gurucharan Group Gram Panchayat Kolkhe	Sarkar	(100/0)	Usarli Khurd	466	2,100			
693	Gurucharan Group Gram Panchayat Kolkhe	Sarkar	(115/0)	Usarli Khurd	487	1,500			
694	Gurucharan Group Gram Panchayat Kolkhe	Sarkar	(120(P)/0)	Usarli Khurd	493	6,948			
695	Gurucharan Group Gram Panchayat Kolkhe	Sarkar	(154(P)/0)	Usarli Khurd	506	3,786			
696	Gurucharan Group Gram Panchayat Kolkhe	Sarkar	(157/1)	Usarli Khurd	509	4,600			
697	Gurucharan	Sarkar	(205/0)	Shivkar	685	2,200	378		
698	Gurucharan	Sarkar	(208(P)/0)	Shivkar	690	287			
699	Gurucharan	Sarkar	(101/0)	Usarli Khurd	467	6,070	451		
700	Gurucharan, Group Grampanchayat Kolkhe	Sarkar	(111/1/1)	Usarli Khurd	480	7,300	450		
701	Sarkari Bin Aakari	Sarkar	(111/1/2)	Usarli Khurd	481	300			
702	Sarkari Bin Aakari	Sarkar	(111/2)	Usarli Khurd	482	1,500			
703	Maharashtra Shasan binaakari pad	Sarkar	(157/2)	Usarli Khurd	510	4,000			
704	Kharaba	Sarkar	(106/0)	Usarli khurd	474	1,290	442		
705	Kirdsar Aakari Pad	Sarkar	(19/0)	Devad	17	400	68		
706	SPA NAINA, CIDCO	Sarkar	(66/0)	Devad	76	4300	1		
707	SPA NAINA, CIDCO	Sarkar	(94/0)	Usarli Khurd	464	200	431		
708	Group Grampanchayat Vichumbe, Gavand	Sarkar	(35/0)	Devad	54	2,000	243	They neither appeared for hearing not submitted any representation.	The said land is under existing road and therefore, the final plot is not granted for said land.
709	Gurcharan, Group Grampanchayat Vichumbe	Sarkar	(78/0)	Devad	78	10735	374	They neither appeared for hearing not submitted any representation.	The said land is under existing road and therefore, the final plot is not granted for said land.
710	Sarkari Parigh	Sarkar	(17/0)	Devad	12	2,000	29, 77	They neither appeared for hearing nor submitted any represenatation	The original land bearing Gut no. 28 has many existing structures and the boundaries of Gut no. 28/1 to 28/11 are not available. Therefore final plots no. 29 to 39 are clubbed together.
711	Sarkari Parigh	Sarkar	(28/1)	Devad	35	3,000			
712	Sarkari Parigh	Class I	(36/1)	Devad	55	4,600			


Proposal of Sanctioned Draft Town Planning Scheme NAINA No. 07									
Sr. No	Name of Owner	Tenure of Land	Gat no / Hissa no	Village	OP No	Area	FP No.	Representation of Owners on Sanctioned Draft TPS -7	Decision of Arbitrator
1	2	3A	3B	3C	4	5	6	7	8
713	Akka S. Katkari	Class I	(28/8)	Devad	42	100	30		The layout of the scheme has been revised by considering the existing structures in the original plot bearing Gut no. 28 and because of this revised reconstituted Final Plot no. 29 & 77 have been allotted at the location of their original plot with corrections in the area as shown in plan no. 4 to the owner(s) and of the area as recorded in table B.
714	Krushna B Juvekar	Class I	(28/2)	Devad	36	100	31		
715	Gotya L. Katkari	Class I	(28/3)	Devad	37	100	32		
716	Govind P. Katkari	Class I	(28/4)	Devad	38	100	33		
717	Barkya P. Gavand	Class I	(28/6)	Devad	40	100	34		
718	Maniji V. Bansude	Class I	(28/9)	Devad	43	100	35		
719	Gulab Govind Haravandkar, prabhakar sakharan Sonawane	Class I	(28/10)	Devad	44	100	36		
720	Sakharam P. Naik	Class I	(28/11)	Devad	45	100	37		
721	Janabai Halya Salunkhe, Shilpa Sanjay Haranvadkar, Lila Pandurang rasal	Class I	(28/5)	Devad	39	100	38		
722	Bhagya S. Lahane	Class I	(28/7)	Devad	41	100	39		
723	SPA NAINA, CIDCO	Class I	(30/A/1/2)	Kolkhe Peth		2400	474A	They neither appeared for hearing nor submitted any representation	The sanctioned draft scheme proposal is confirmed. Final Plot No. 474A as shown in plan No. 4, has been allotted to the owner(s) and of the area, as recorded in Table B.


(Abhiraj Girkar)

Arbitrator

Town Planning Scheme, NAINA No 07

Date: 29th December, 2023


(Nirmalkumar Chaudhari)
Deputy Secretary

Urban Development Department, GoM

