Consolidated Responses to Observations & Suggestions shared on byelaws

23 Sep 2026.

Draft Version.

Final version subject to the decision of General Body, once it is formed.

Table of Contents

EXPLANATORY NOTE ON BYELAWS & OPERATIONAL STRUCTURE *4*

Prepared to address concerns from Homebuyers of the Project Under CIRP 4

1. Registered Office Location *4*

Why Visakhapatnam Was the Immediate Choice **4**

Future Flexibility **4**

2. Membership Fee & Annual Subscription *5*

Membership Uncertainty **5**

Corpus Under Three Fee Models **5**

What Sangham Must Fund **5**

Final Position **5**

3. Executive Committee Size (9 vs 15 vs Flexible) *6*

Membership-Based Justification **6**

Final Position **6**

4. Digital Voting vs Written Request *6*

Considering Sangham Email Accounts **6**

Digital voting: 6

Written requests: 6

Final Position **6**

5. Representation Approval Process *7*

Why It Matters **7**

Membership-Based Practicality **7**

Final Position **7**

6. Quorum Structure *7*

Membership-Based Quorum **7**

Membership 7

Practical Quorum 7

Final Position **7**

7. Fund Utilization Limits *8*

Corpus-Based Limits **8**

Why Email Approval Helps **8**

Final Position **8**

8. Legal Proceedings Approval *8*

CIRP Requires Urgent Legal Action **8**

Membership-Based Approval **8**

Final Position **8**

9. Corpus Fund Controls ***9***

Why Controls Matter **9**

Membership & Corpus-Based Controls **9**

Final Position **9**

10. Amendment Flexibility & Member Rights ***9***

Why Flexibility Is Essential **9**

Membership-Based Amendment Thresholds **9**

Final Position **9**

OVERALL SUMMARY ***10***

Draft version

EXPLANATORY NOTE ON BYELAWS & OPERATIONAL STRUCTURE

Prepared to address concerns from Homebuyers of the Project Under CIRP

This document explains the rationale behind the RAMAKRISHNA VENUZIA GRUHA KONUGOLUDARULA SANKSHEMA SANGHAM's (**Sangham**'s) present byelaws and operational choices, while also presenting unbiased analysis and leaving all final decisions to the **General Body (GB)** once membership is established.

The Sangham currently has:

1) **No general members yet**
2) Only the **founding committee (9 members)**
3) Membership numbers are uncertain (could be 49, 135, or 200+)
4) Corpus size is uncertain
5) CIRP requirements are dynamic and time-sensitive

All explanations below are based on these factors.

---

1. Registered Office Location

Why Visakhapatnam Was the Immediate Choice

1) A committee member in Visakhapatnam volunteered his home address, provided address proof, and agreed to receive notices.
2) This avoided rent agreements, third-party dependency, and repeated travel for registration.
3) RP, AR, and major secured creditors (LIC Housing, JC Flowers) are located in **Hyderabad**, making Vizag reasonably connected.

Future Flexibility

If members later find a reliable arrangement in Vijayawada, the GB can shift the registered office through a simple resolution.

---

2. Membership Fee & Annual Subscription

Membership Uncertainty

Assuming, out of 300 claimants:

1) 75 already belong to another society, may not see a need to join another society
2) 60 may not join due to personal preferences.
3) 30 may join later.
4) Immediate realistic membership ≈ **135**
5) **Conservative scenario:** **committee + 40 = 49 members**

Corpus Under Three Fee Models

Model	49 Members	135 Members	165 Members
₹1,000 + ₹2,000	₹1,47,000	₹4,05,000	₹4,95,000
₹500 + ₹500	₹49,000	₹1,35,000	₹1,65,000
One-time ₹1,000	₹49,000	₹1,35,000	₹1,65,000

What Sangham Must Fund

1) Legal filings & NCLT petitions & any other petitions (NCLAT / SC etc)
2) Forensic audit review
3) Valuation objections
4) Expert consultations
5) RP/AR coordination
6) Communication infrastructure
7) Administrative compliance
8) Unknowns / etc.

Final Position

Given uncertainty in membership and corpus, **GB should decide the fee model**.

Draft version

3. Executive Committee Size (9 vs 15 vs Flexible)

Membership-Based Justification

1) If only 49 members join → 9 members are adequate; 15 is disproportionate.
2) If 135 members join → 15 becomes reasonable.
3) If 200+ members join → committee may need 18–21 members.

Final Position

Committee size must be **proportional to membership strength**, and **GB should decide** once membership stabilizes.

---

4. Digital Voting vs Written Request

Considering Sangham Email Accounts

Digital voting:

1) Fast
2) Transparent
3) Timestamped
4) Accessible for members abroad
5) Scalable for 200+ members
6) Essential for urgent CIRP decisions

Written requests:

1) Authentic
2) Works only when membership is small (49 members)
3) Not practical for 135 or 200+ members

Final Position

Voting mechanism must be **membership-dependent**, and **GB should decide**.

Draft version

5. Representation Approval Process

Why It Matters

Representations to RP, AR, CoC, NCLT, etc. must reflect the collective voice of homebuyers.

Membership-Based Practicality

1) 49 members → written or email approval manageable
2) 135 members → email approval essential
3) 200+ members → digital voting mandatory

Final Position

Approval mechanism should be **flexible**, and **GB should decide**.

---

6. Quorum Structure

Membership-Based Quorum

Membership	Practical Quorum
1. **49 members**	2. 25–33%
3. **135 members**	4. 20–33%
5. **200+ members**	6. 15–25%

High quorum (50%) becomes impractical as membership grows.

Final Position

Quorum must be **proportional to membership**, and **GB should decide**.

Draft version

7. Fund Utilization Limits

Corpus-Based Limits

Corpus	Practical Limit
₹49,000–₹1,47,000	₹5,000–₹10,000
₹1,35,000–₹4,05,000	₹15,000–₹25,000
₹1,65,000–₹4,95,000	₹25,000–₹40,000

Why Email Approval Helps

1) Fast
2) Timestamped
3) Transparent
4) Accessible
5) CIRP-aligned

Final Position

Limits must be **based on corpus size**, and **GB should decide**.

---

8. Legal Proceedings Approval

CIRP Requires Urgent Legal Action

1) Objections
2) Petitions
3) Affidavits
4) Emergency filings

Draft version

Membership-Based Approval

1) 49 members → written/email approval
2) 135 members → email voting
3) 200+ members → digital voting mandatory

Final Position

Legal approval mechanism must be **flexible**, and **GB should decide**.

Draft version

9. Corpus Fund Controls

Why Controls Matter

— Prevent misuse & Maintain trust, Ensure transparency & Support urgent CIRP actions

Membership & Corpus-Based Controls

1) Small membership → strict controls
2) Medium membership → moderate controls
3) Large membership → flexible controls with audits

Final Position

Corpus controls must be **proportional to corpus size**, and **GB should decide**.

---

10. Amendment Flexibility & Member Rights

Why Flexibility Is Essential

CIRP is dynamic. The Sangham must adapt to:

New RP/AR strategies, New legal requirements, New membership levels & New financial realities.

Membership-Based Amendment Thresholds

Membership	Practical Threshold
49 members	**50%**
135 members	**33%**
200+ members	**25%**

Final Position

Amendment thresholds must be **membership-dependent**, and **GB should decide**.

OVERALL SUMMARY

The Sangham is at a zero-membership stage, and future membership is uncertain. Therefore:

1) Committee size
2) Fee structure
3) Voting mechanism
4) Quorum
5) Fund utilization limits
6) Legal approval process
7) Corpus controls
8) Amendment thresholds

should not be rigidly fixed now.

All these must be **decided by the General Body**, once membership stabilizes and actual needs become clear.

The present byelaws were drafted:

1) before email infrastructure was planned
2) before membership numbers were known
3) to ensure authenticity and prevent misuse
4) **to provide a starting framework**

But they are **not final**. They are **fully amendable** by the General Body.

Draft Version.

Final version subject to the decision of General Body, once it is formed.