

14th August, 2023

BSE Limited
Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers,
Dalal Street Fort,
Mumbai – 400 001
BSE Scrip Code: 500020

National Stock Exchange of India Ltd.
Exchange Plaza, 5th floor,
Plot No.C/1, 'G' Block,
Bandra-Kurla Complex, Bandra (E),
Mumbai – 400 051
NSE Symbol: BOMDYEING

Dear Sir/ Madam,

SUB: DISCLOSURE UNDER REGULATION 30 OF SEBI (LISTING OBLIGATIONS AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS) REGULATIONS 2015 ("LISTING REGULATIONS").

In terms of the provisions of Regulation 30 (4) Part A Para B point 8 of Schedule III of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015. Company hereby discloses the enclosed details.

In terms of SEBI/HO/CFD/PoD2/CIR/P/2023/120 dated July 11, 2023 read with Regulation 30 of the (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, the information required is given in the '**Annexure – I**'.

You are requested to take note of the above.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,
For **The Bombay Dyeing and Manufacturing Company Limited**

Sanjive Arora
Company Secretary
Membership No.: F3814
Encl: As above.

CC: National Securities Depository Ltd.,
Trade World, 4th Floor, Kamala Mills Compound,
S. Bapat Marg, Lower Parel,
Mumbai - 400 013.

Central Depository Services (India) Ltd.,
Marathon Futurex, A Wing, 25th Floor
N. M. Joshi Marg, Lower Parel
Mumbai - 400 013

Bourse de Luxembourg,
Societe de La Bourse de Luxembourg,
Societe Anonyme, R. C. 36222,
BP 165, L- 2011,
LUXEMBOURG.

Citibank N.A.,
DR Account Management,
Citigroup Corporate & Investment Bank,
14th Floor, 388, Greenwich Street,
NEWYORK, NY (USA) 10013.

M/s KFin Technologies Ltd.
Selenium Tower B, Plot 31-32, Gachibowli,
Financial District, Nanakramguda, Hyderabad,
Telangana – 500 032

Annexure I

1)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Information
1.	Name of the Opposing Party	Sarva Shramik Sanghatana
2.	Court/ Tribunal/Agency where Litigation is filed	Bombay High Court
3.	Brief details of Dispute/Litigation;	<p>A Civil Writ Petition bearing number 2368 of 2013 has been filed by Sarva Shramik Sanghatna (being a registered Trade Union) (“Petitioner”) against Brihanmumbai Municipal Corporation for Greater Mumbai (“MCGM/ Respondent No. 1”), State of Maharashtra through Urban Development Department (“Respondent No. 2”), The Maharashtra Housing and Area Development Authority (“MHADA/ Respondent No. 3”), The Monitoring Committee, through the Member-Secretary, Office of the Chief Engineer (“Respondent No. 4”) and Our Company (“Respondent No. 5” collectively “Respondents”) before the Bombay High Court.</p> <p>The Petitioners contention under the said petition is that Regulations 58(1) (a) and (b) of the Development Control Regulations, 1991 is applicable to our Company and therefore our Company would be liable to share higher percentage of open land with MHADA. Further, Bombay High Court vide its order dated November 19, 2013 has directed our Company to handover the physical possession of the unencumbered vacant land admeasuring 66,651 sq. mtrs., to MCGM and MHADA at Wadala as above and keeping apart 10,000 sq. mtrs. The company has complied with the directions of the Hon’ble Bombay High Court. The matter is currently pending.</p>
4.	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc.;	No Quantified Claim Amount
5.	Quantum of claims, if any;	No Quantified Claim Amount

2)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Information
1.	Name of the Opposing Party	Securities Exchange Board of India (SEBI)
2.	Court/ Tribunal/Agency where Litigation is filed	Securities Appellate Tribunal (SAT)
3.	Brief details of Dispute/Litigation;	<p>SEBI intimated our Company on January 18, 2019, about a complaint lodged by a shareholder of our Company, alleging, amongst other things, that a scheme of arrangement between our Company and SCAL sanctioned by the National Company Law Tribunal on February 21, 2019, had been fraudulent. SEBI sought information and documents by way of summons, under Sections 11 and 11C of the SEBI Act. SEBI issued a show cause notice (“SCN”) bearing no. SEBI/HO/CFID/CFID1/OW/P/2021/12045/1 to 12045/10 dated June 11, 2021 to our Company, Mr. Nusli Neville Wadia, Mr. Ness Nusli Wadia, Mr. Jehangir Nusli Wadia, Mr. Durgesh Mehta, (all in capacity of Directors, ex. managing director and ex. Jt. managing director of our Company) (collectively “Noticees”) and SCAL Services Limited (“SCAL”), Mr. D.S. Gagrat, Mr. N H Datanwala, Mr. Shailesh Karnik and Mr. R. Chandrasekharan, (all in the capacity of the directors and ex. directors of SCAL) with regards to Sections 11(1), 11(2)(e), 11(4), 11(4A) and 11B of the SEBI Act, 1992 including debaring from buying, selling, or otherwise dealing in securities, for an appropriate period should not be issued for the alleged provision of the SEBI Act, Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade Practices relating to Securities Market Regulations, 2003 and SEBI Listing Regulations. All Noticees vide interim replies to the SCN dated July 27, 2021 and detailed replies to the SCN dated August 9, 2021 have denied all the allegations. Further, The Company and the concerned noticees have submitted appeal to Securities Appellate Tribunal (SAT). The SEBI Order has been stayed by the SAT on the basis of appeal by the Noticees at SAT. The hearing on the subject matter is underway and the final order will be issued</p>

		post conclusion of hearings in due course.
4.	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc.;	Rs.2,00,00,000/- (Rupees Two Crore Only) & Rs. 25,00, 000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Lakhs Only) for the Company
5.	Quantum of claims, if any;	The hearing on the subject matter is underway and the final order will be issued post conclusion of hearings in due course.

3)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Information
1.	Name of the Opposing Party	Axis Bank Limited
2.	Court/ Tribunal/Agency where Litigation is filed	Bombay High Court
3.	Brief details of Dispute/Litigation;	A Commercial Arbitration Petition No. 289 of 2022 under section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 has been initiated by Axis Bank Limited ("Petitioner") against our Company challenging the award dated March 11, 2022 ("Award") passed by the Arbitral Tribunal. The Petitioner has alleged that our Company failed to provide timely possession of the property along with exclusive and irrevocable right of the building known as Wadia Tower as per the terms of the agreement dated May 15, 2010 ("Agreement"). The Petitioner has further alleged that our Company is in breach of the terms of the said Agreement and is not entitled to any reliefs granted to our Company under the said Award. The Petitioner has prayed for setting aside the reliefs granted to our Company in the said Award. The Award granted in favour of the Company for Principal plus interest. The matter is currently pending in Bombay High Court.
4.	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc.;	The challenge of the Petitioner is in dispute and the quantum of liability, if any, will be subject to final adjudication by a competent court. The matter is currently pending.
5.	Quantum of claims, if any;	The challenge of the Petitioner is in dispute and the quantum of liability, if any, will be subject to final adjudication by a competent court. The matter is currently pending.

4)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Information
1.	Name of the Opposing Party	Bina Deepak Panchamia & others
2.	Court/ Tribunal/Agency where Litigation is filed	Bombay High Court
3.	Brief details of Dispute/Litigation;	A Suit No. 986 of 2015 was initiated by Bina Deepak Panchamia and others (“Plaintiffs”) against our Company and others (“Defendants”) before the Bombay High Court in respect of a residential project developed by our Company. The Plaintiffs have claimed that our Company has changed the layout of the building, delayed in handing over possession, deficient services and increased maintenance charges with respect to its realty project and further claimed compensation amounting to Rs 100 crores to the Plaintiffs towards damages. The matter is currently pending.
4.	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc.;	The claim is disputed and the quantum of liability, if any, will be subject to final adjudication by a competent court.
5.	Quantum of claims, if any;	The claim is disputed and the quantum of liability, if any, will be subject to final adjudication by a competent court.