

**HATTEN LAND LIMITED**  
**(UNDER JUDICIAL MANAGEMENT)**  
(Company Registration No. 199301388D)  
(Incorporated in the Republic of Singapore)  
(the “Company”)

**MINUTES OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING**

The Annual General Meeting of Hatten Land Limited (the “**Company**”) was held at:

**PLACE** : Function Room, LR Floor, 380 Jalan Besar, ARC 380 Singapore 209000

**DATE** : Tuesday, 21 April 2026

**TIME** : 9.05 a.m.

**PRESENT** : As set out in the attendance records maintained by the Company.

**IN ATTENDANCE** : As set out in the attendance records maintained by the Company.

**CHAIRMAN OF THE MEETING** : Mr. Tan Wei Cheong, Joint and Several Judicial Manager

**QUORUM**

The Chairman of the Annual General Meeting (the “**AGM**” or “**Meeting**”) sought the confirmation of the Company Secretary that a quorum was present and the Company Secretary confirmed that the quorum necessary for the AGM was present. Therefore, the Chairman declared the AGM open at 9.05 a.m..

**NOTICE OF AGM**

All relevant information relating to the proposed resolutions are set out in the Notice of the AGM dated 6 April 2026 (the “**Notice**”) together with the Circular which has been circulated for the required statutory period to the shareholders of the Company (“**Shareholders**”). With the consent of the Shareholders present at the Meeting, the Notice convening the Meeting was taken as read.

**SUBMISSION OF QUESTIONS FOR THE AGM**

The Chairman informed that, as stated in the Notice, Shareholders were invited to submit substantial and relevant questions relating to the resolutions to be tabled for approval at the AGM either in advance of, or during the AGM itself. As at the cut-off date for the submission of questions, the Company had not received any questions relating to the resolution to be tabled for approval at the AGM.

**VOTING BY POLL**

The Shareholders were informed that the resolutions tabled at the AGM would be voted by poll as required under the Listing Manual Section B: Rules of Catalist of the Singapore Exchange Securities Trading Limited (the “**SGX-ST**”) (the “**Catalist Rules**”).

The Shareholders were further informed that based on the information provided in the Notice, Shareholders who wished to exercise their voting rights at the AGM could do so either by submitting the instrument of appointing a proxy(ies) to vote on their behalf, or by voting in person at the AGM. All Proxy Forms lodged had been checked, counted, and verified by the Polling Agent and the Scrutineers, and were found to be in order.

The Shareholders were also informed that B.A.C.S. Private Limited had been appointed as the Polling Agent, and Gong Corporate Services Pte. Ltd. had been appointed as the Scrutineer for the poll conducted at the AGM.

The poll of the AGM would be conducted following the completion of the formal proceedings of the Meeting. The Chairman then proceeded with the business of the Meeting.

**ORDINARY BUSINESSES:**

**1. RESOLUTION 1: AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND JUDICIAL MANAGERS' STATEMENT FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2024 AND THE INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT THEREON**

The Meeting proceeded to receive and adopt the Judicial Managers' Statement and the Audited Financial Statements of the Company and the Group for the financial year ended 30 June 2024 together with the Independent Auditors' Report thereon.

The Chairman invited Shareholders to raise any questions in relation to the resolution.

**Question 1**

Why the Board of Directors ("**Board**") is not present at the AGM and why the AGM is being conducted by the Judicial Manager.

**Company's response**

The Chairman explained that pursuant to the appointment of the Judicial Manager, the powers of the directors had effectively ceased. While the directors remained appointed to the Company, they no longer retained authority over the management and affairs of the Company. Accordingly, the AGM was being conducted by the Judicial Manager. He added that the statement included in the Audited Financial Statements was issued by the Judicial Managers.

**Question 2**

A shareholder asked about the duration of the appointment of the Judicial Managers and requested an update on the current status of the restructuring and judicial management of the Company.

**Company's response**

The Chairman responded that the Judicial Managers had been appointed for more than one year. He further updated shareholders that the Company had entered into two agreements in connection with the proposed restructuring exercise. One of the agreements related to the proposed acquisition of a target company for the purpose of injecting a new business into the Company.

The Chairman also informed shareholders that one of the Company's main subsidiaries, which held the majority of the Group's operations and subsidiaries in Malaysia, had been placed into liquidation. Despite efforts undertaken, the Company had been unable to identify a viable investor to support the legacy business. As the subsidiary was insolvent, the Company had made the difficult decision to place the subsidiary into liquidation.

Following the liquidation, the Group no longer had substantial operating businesses. As part of the restructuring efforts, the Company had therefore entered into an agreement to acquire a new business, and the proposed transaction was currently in progress. The Chairman expressed hope that trading of the Company's shares could resume within the year.

The Chairman further explained that the restructuring exercise would effectively recapitalise the Company, and that the Group would no longer continue its previous core business. Instead, following completion of the proposed acquisition, the Group would venture into a new line of business in the construction industry through a Singapore-based company.

The Chairman added that the restructuring process had been progressing satisfactorily and that the Company was continuing to comply with all relevant regulatory and compliance requirements, including obtaining the approval of the audited financial statements by shareholders at the AGM.

**Question 3**

What are the Company's plans in relation to the properties in Malacca, specifically referring to two hotels and a shopping mall which operated in Malacca.

**Company's response**

The Chairman clarified that the Company did not own or operate any hotels within the Group. He explained that the hotels referred to by the shareholder were understood to be held separately under entities belonging to the Company's major shareholders in their personal capacity, and not under the Company or the Group.

The Chairman reiterated that the intermediate holding company which held the Group's Malaysian operations and various Malaysian subsidiaries had already been placed into liquidation. Accordingly, matters relating to those assets would be handled by the liquidator of the intermediate holding company. The Chairman further clarified that, as far as the Company was concerned, the Group had neither previously owned nor currently owned any hotel properties.

**Question 4**

Is the Company operated as a management or hotel management company in Malacca and whether the hotel properties are owned by the major shareholders of the Company.

**Company's response**

The Chairman clarified that he was not privy to the personal business interests of the relevant parties. However, based on his understanding, the properties referred to by the shareholder could be related to those personal businesses. The Chairman further reiterated that, as far as the Company was concerned, the Group did not own or operate any hotel properties.

**Question 5**

What are the Company's assets held in Malaysia?

**Company's response**

The Chairman responded that the information for the Company's assets in Malaysia is disclosed in the Annual Report, mainly comprised residential and commercial units. He explained that many of these units had been completed but remained unsold, and the Company had not been able to monetise them as these assets were charged to banks and financial institutions. The Chairman also shared that the Group had an uncompleted property development project known as Harbor City, which receivers had been appointed. In addition, the Group held units in various shopping malls in Malacca. Although these mall units had been completed, the Company had similarly been unable to monetise them, and such assets were also charged to various financial institutions.

**Question 6**

A shareholder asked whether the liabilities relating to the uncompleted Malaysian projects remained obligations to the buyers, and whether the Malaysian operations had been ring-fenced through special purpose vehicles such that the liabilities would not affect the Company following the proposed reverse takeover ("RTO").

**Company's response**

The Chairman responded that where there were buyers involved in the uncompleted projects, the relevant entities would continue to have obligations towards those buyers.

The Chairman further explained that, although the Malaysian operations were held through subsidiary entities, the Company had provided corporate guarantees to various financial institutions in respect of financing facilities granted to the subsidiaries. As such, certain liabilities could flow back to the Company through these corporate guarantees.

To address this, the Company intended to undertake a restructuring exercise in Singapore, potentially through a scheme of arrangement process sanctioned by the Singapore High Court. The Chairman explained that the Company had entered into agreements to acquire a new target business through the issuance of new shares, with the intention of injecting the new business into the Company after carving out the legacy business.

Under the proposed restructuring process, the Company would present a proposal to its creditors for consideration. Subject to obtaining the requisite approval thresholds from creditors and subsequent sanction by the Singapore High Court, the liabilities of the Company, including liabilities arising from corporate guarantees, could be restructured and potentially extinguished as part of the scheme of arrangement process. The Chairman added that, if the restructuring and proposed business injection were successfully completed, the Company would effectively be positioned to continue operations with the new business while being substantially free from its legacy liabilities.

#### **Question 7**

A shareholder asked whether the proposed scheme of arrangement would also cover claims relating to home buyers of the uncompleted Malaysian projects, noting that the restructuring appeared mainly focused on institutional and financial creditors. The shareholder further queried whether home buyers might attempt to pursue claims up the corporate chain against the Company.

#### **Company's response**

The Chairman clarified that the Company had not provided any corporate guarantees or obligations to the end home buyers of the Malaysian projects. He explained that the obligations to the home buyers rested with the respective project companies from which the buyers had purchased their properties. He added that the Company had not provided guarantees to such buyers and therefore the home buyers would not have recourse against the Company at the holding company level.

The Chairman acknowledged that it was possible for parties to attempt to pursue claims against the Company. However, he explained that the proposed scheme of arrangement and restructuring process was intended to centrally address claims and liabilities through the proposed scheme of arrangement sanctioned by the Singapore High Court.

Following the restructuring, the Company's business and remaining assets were expected to primarily comprise the new Singapore-based business to be injected into the Company. He added that, in relation to any overseas creditors who chose not to participate in the scheme process, their practical recourse would ultimately be against assets located in Singapore after the restructuring, as the legacy overseas businesses and assets would have been carved out from the restructured group.

#### **Question 8**

A shareholder asked about the progress of the consent process for the proposed scheme of arrangement and the overall restructuring timeline.

#### **Company's response**

The Chairman explained that the scheme of arrangement process was still in the preparatory stage. The Company would first need to file an application to the court, following which the Singapore High Court would decide whether to grant leave for the Company to convene meetings of its creditors. Following the leave granted by the Singapore High Court, the notices would then be issued to creditors to participate in the scheme process. He shared that this step had not yet taken place, but the Company was hopeful of making the application within approximately one month.

In response to a follow-up question on whether the RTO process could proceed only after the scheme of arrangement, the Chairman explained that both processes were being run in parallel to save time. He noted that the RTO process has its own regulatory timeline and requirements, similar to an initial public offering process. The Chairman added that the intention was for both the scheme of arrangement and the RTO process to be completed and aligned.

**Question 9**

A shareholder asked about the due diligence process on Metrocon Pte. Ltd..

**Company's response**

The Sponsor shared that an announcement in relation to the submission of pre-admission notification to the SGX-ST has been released. The Chairman added that the statutory audit on the target company has been completed prior the said submission to the SGX-ST.

**Question 10**

A shareholder asked whether, in relation to the RTO and restructuring exercise, there would be a share consolidation and whether existing shareholders would be given an opportunity to participate in the new entity through a placement or rights issue.

**Company's response**

The Chairman shared that a placement exercise was likely to be undertaken as part of the restructuring. However, he commented that it had not yet been determined whether existing shareholders would be included in such a placement or offered participation through a rights issue.

The Chairman explained that the final structure would depend on discussions among stakeholders as part of the post-restructuring process. Accordingly, he was unable to provide a definitive comment at this stage.

**Question 11**

A shareholder sought the clarification on the Note 15 of the Notes to Financial Statements in relation to the development properties as the Chairman has mentioned that the Company did not own any properties in Malacca.

**Company's response**

The Chairman clarified that the Company did not own any hotel properties within the Group. He reiterated that the Group did have property assets in Malaysia, including residential and commercial properties, which were held through Malaysian subsidiary companies.

He further explained that the Malaysian subsidiaries were held by an intermediate holding company, which had already been placed into liquidation. As a result, he stated that the likelihood of any meaningful recovery from the Malaysian property assets flowing up to the Company was very minimal. This was due to the insolvency of the intermediate holding company and the underlying properties were subject to first legal charges in favour of lenders in Malaysia. Accordingly, any proceeds from disposal of such properties would first be applied to settle secured lenders, with only any surplus potentially flowing up to the corporate structure.

The Chairman further added that the Group did hold commercial units in various malls but reiterated that there were no hotel properties within the Group. He also clarified that the Group did not have any hotel management companies.

**Question 12**

A shareholder asked for clarification on the ownership status of the strata title units within the projects undertaken by the Malaysian subsidiaries and the Company's plan for the remaining unsold units in Harbor City. The shareholder also queried whether any losses from asset disposals would affect the Company and whether the banks could pursue the Company in relation to the underlying assets.

**Company's response**

The Chairman clarified that the Malaysian property assets were held by Malaysian subsidiary entities. He explained that there were multiple layers of ownership, with an intermediate holding company above the Malaysian subsidiaries. That intermediate holding company had already been placed into liquidation and was therefore under the control of the liquidator. The Chairman stated that the Group's control over the Malaysian property-holding structure had effectively been severed at the intermediate level, and the Malaysian subsidiaries were now operating under the liquidation framework.

In response to questions on potential losses and bank recourse, the Chairman mentioned that corporate guarantees had been provided at the holding company level. However, he explained that the proposed scheme of arrangement in Singapore was intended to address these liabilities. Under the proposed restructuring, creditors (including banks) would need to participate in the scheme in order to pursue claims against the Company. Upon successful sanction of the scheme and completion of the restructuring, the legacy liabilities would be dealt with and creditors would be bound by the outcome of the court-approved process.

The Chairman further clarified that, due to the liquidation of the intermediate holding company, the Group had effectively lost control over those assets and would no longer consolidate them in its financial statements moving forward. He added that the intention of the restructuring was to allow the Company to "start afresh," with legacy assets and liabilities being dealt with through the restructuring process, while the restructured Group would focus on the new business going forward.

The Chairman further emphasized that there were no hotel management companies under the Group, whether at the Company level or within its Malaysian subsidiaries.

**Question 13**

A shareholder asked about the completion timeline for the proposed scheme of arrangement and the overall restructuring, including the RTO, acquisition of the new business, and resumption of trading.

**Company's response**

The Chairman explained that several processes were currently underway in parallel as part of the restructuring exercise. This included the proposed acquisition of a Singapore-based construction company, namely Metrocon Pte. Ltd., which would be injected into the Company via RTO through the issuance of new shares.

In terms of timeline, the Chairman shared the intention that, based on the current progress, the Company was targeting to resume trading within the year, subject to completion of the relevant restructuring steps and regulatory approvals. He added that additional general meeting (EGM) would still be required, particularly to approve matters relating to the acquisition of the target company and the issuance of new shares.

The Chairman further shared that the objective of the restructuring was to carve out the legacy loss-making business and liabilities, thereby enabling the injection of the new business and positioning the Group for a return to profitability and eventual resumption of trading.

**Question 14**

A shareholder noted that EGM would be held and asked whether the major shareholders have the right to participate and vote at such EGM.

**Company's response**

The Chairman affirmed that major shareholders would have the right to participate and vote at the EGM, provided that they remained registered as shareholders of the Company at the relevant time.

**Question 15**

A shareholder asked for an indicative estimate of dilution under the RTO. The shareholder also asked whether any pro forma or illustrative shareholding information to be disclosed.

**Company's response**

The Chairman shared that multiple key variables were still being negotiated and finalised. These included the quantum of liabilities to be settled through issuance of shares, the consideration shares to be issued to the target company vendor, and any allocations to funders involved in the restructuring process. He further explained that, given the Company's insolvent position, creditors were expected to have priority in the allocation of shares, and their participation would form a significant part of the overall capital restructuring under the scheme of arrangement.

The Chairman also shared that proportions for the shares to be allocated among the new business vendor, funders, creditors, and existing shareholders, had not yet been determined. No pro forma dilution figures had been released to date, as discussions with major creditors were still ongoing. The Company intended to provide clearer information only after greater certainty had been reached on creditor participation and the structure of the scheme.

The Chairman further acknowledged that, while the outcome would involve dilution for existing shareholders, the alternative scenario would be liquidation, in which shareholders would likely receive little or no recovery. He stated that the restructuring was therefore intended to preserve value to the extent possible and to retain as much value for stakeholders as feasible under the circumstances.

**Question 16**

A shareholder asked about the identity of the funder supporting the transitional restructuring exercise and whether this funding arrangement had been disclosed. The shareholder also sought clarification on the nature of the funder's business.

**Company's response**

The Chairman affirmed that the funding arrangement had been disclosed and announced to the SGX-ST. He shared that the funder is a company known as Skyone Holdings Sdn. Bhd., a private investor, who had provided funding to support the Company's restructuring exercise, as the Group currently had no available funding resources. He added that this funding had also supported necessary work during the process, including audit-related costs.

**Question 17**

A shareholder asked about the Malaysian subsidiaries' remaining commercial property units, noting that these assets are financed by bank loans with corporate guarantees from the Company. The shareholder further asked whether the intention was to sell the properties or hold them for investment purposes going forward.

**Company's response**

The Chairman explained that the Company no longer had control over the decision-making in relation to those Malaysian property assets. He stated that a liquidator had been appointed at the level of the intermediate holding company holding the Malaysian subsidiaries, and therefore any decisions regarding the assets would be made by the liquidator.

The Chairman clarified that the Malaysian subsidiaries were no longer effectively under the Group's control due to the liquidation of the intermediate holding company. As such, the planning and management of those assets would be handled by the appointed liquidator rather than by the Company. The Chairman further reiterated that the Group's focus at the Company level was on the restructuring exercise in Singapore.

**Question 18**

A shareholder asked whether the liquidator in Malaysia would be able to make claims during the scheme of arrangement process.

**Company's response**

The Chairman explained that, in relation to the intercompany positions, the Malaysian subsidiaries currently had obligations within the group structure. He shared that if there were any recoveries in Malaysia, such amounts could technically flow upwards within the corporate structure, subject to the liquidation process.

He further explained that the decision to place the intermediate holding company into liquidation was intended to allow the liquidator to manage and resolve all related issues at that level, including intercompany matters. This would enable the Company to focus on its restructuring exercise in Singapore without being directly involved in the operational and asset-level issues in Malaysia.

**Question 19**

A shareholder questioned why the Company state that it did not have decision-making control over the Malaysian subsidiaries, given that the Company is the parent company of those subsidiaries which own the underlying properties.

**Company's response**

The Chairman explained that the Group's structure consisted of multiple layers. He stated that the Malaysian subsidiaries were held through an intermediate holding company, which in turn was owned by the Company. He clarified that the immediate reporting line from the Malaysian subsidiaries was to the intermediate holding company, which was currently under liquidation and controlled by the liquidator.

He further explained that the liquidator's primary duty was to act in the interests of creditors at that level and to determine how best to realise value from the Malaysian assets, including through potential sale or other monetisation strategies. Any proceeds from such processes would first be used to settle bank borrowings and other liabilities at the Malaysian subsidiary level.

The Chairman shared that only after satisfying the liabilities of the Malaysian subsidiaries, and subsequently the obligations at the intermediate holding company level, the Company, as an equity shareholder of the intermediate holding company, would only receive any residual value, if any, after all creditors at the Malaysian subsidiaries had been fully satisfied.

**Question 20**

A shareholder asked whether any Malaysian banks had approached the Company to participate in the scheme of arrangement, noting the corporate guarantees provided by the Company in relation to Malaysian subsidiaries. The shareholder further asked about the current market value of the Malaysian properties relative to outstanding bank loans, and whether the secured lenders were mainly Malaysian banks or included Singapore banks with exposure to Malaysian assets.

**Company's response**

The Chairman responded that the Company had been engaging with the banks since the appointment of the Judicial Managers, with the objective of managing and mitigating their exposure. Prior to the appointment of the liquidator, the Judicial Managers had also attempted to work with the Malaysian subsidiaries and appointed agents to explore asset disposals and monetisation of properties in order to reduce outstanding bank exposure. However, these efforts were unsuccessful, as the Malaysian

property market, particularly in Malacca was unable to absorb the supply, and buyers were only willing to transact at distressed or fire-sale pricing, which the banks were not willing to accept.

The Chairman shared that no recent formal valuation of the Malaysian properties had been conducted. While historical valuation reports stated that the book value of the properties exceeded the related loan exposure, however, in practice the Group had been unable to sell the assets even at discounted prices, indicating a significant gap between theoretical valuation and market realisability.

The Chairman further shared that the details of the creditor composition, including banks, would be disclosed as part of the scheme of arrangement process. The Chairman reiterated that despite attempts to sell the properties at below-market price through appointed third-party agents, the Group had been unable to secure buyers.

There being no further questions from the Shareholders, the Chairman proposed the following motion to be put to vote.

**“RESOLVED:**

That the Judicial Managers’ Statements and the Audited Financial Statements of the Company and the Group for the financial year ended 30 June 2024 together with the Independent Auditors’ Report be and are hereby received and adopted.”

**2. RESOLUTION 2: AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND JUDICIAL MANAGERS’ STATEMENT FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2025 AND THE INDEPENDENT AUDITORS’ REPORT THEREON**

The Meeting proceeded to receive and adopt the Judicial Managers’ Statement and the Audited Financial Statements of the Company and the Group for the financial year ended 30 June 2025 together with the Independent Auditors’ Report thereon.

The Chairman invited Shareholders to raise any questions in relation to the resolution.

There being no further questions from the Shareholders, the Chairman proposed the following motion to be put to vote.

**“RESOLVED:**

That the Judicial Managers’ Statements and the Audited Financial Statements of the Company and the Group for the financial year ended 30 June 2025 together with the Independent Auditors’ Report be and are hereby received and adopted.”

**3. RESOLUTION 3: RE-ELECTION OF MR. YEO BOON KEONG AS A DIRECTOR**

Resolution 3 is to re-elect Mr. Yeo Boon Keong (“**Mr. Yeo**”) as a Director of the Company pursuant to Regulation 122 of the Company’s Constitution.

Mr. Yeo, who was retiring as a Director of the Company pursuant to Regulation 122 of the Company’s Constitution, had signified his consent to continue in office.

The Chairman invited Shareholders to raise any questions in relation to the resolution.

There being no questions from the Shareholders, the Chairman proposed the following motion to be put to vote.

**“RESOLVED:**

That Mr. Yeo, who retired from office in accordance with Regulation 122 of the Constitution of the Company and being eligible, offered himself for re-election, be and is hereby re-elected as a Director of the Company.

Mr. Yeo will, upon re-election as a Director of the Company, remain as the remain as the Independent Non-Executive Director of the Company and will be considered independent for the purpose of Rule 704(7) of the Catalist Rules.”

**4. RESOLUTION 4: RE-APPOINTMENT OF MESSRS FORVIS MAZARS LLP AS AUDITORS AND TO AUTHORISE THE DIRECTORS OF THE COMPANY TO FIX THEIR REMUNERATION**

The Board has recommended to re-appoint Messrs Forvis Mazars LLP as the auditors of the Company for the ensuing year and to authorise the Directors of the Company to fix their remuneration.

Messrs Forvis Mazars LLP have expressed their willingness to continue in office.

The Chairman invited Shareholders to raise any questions in relation to the resolution.

There being no questions from the Shareholders, the Chairman proposed the following motion to be put to vote.

“That Messrs Forvis Mazars LLP, who have expressed their willingness to continue in office, be and are hereby re-appointed as auditors of the Company until the conclusion of the next AGM at a fee to be agreed between the Directors and Messrs Forvis Mazars LLP.”

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

As no notice of any other ordinary business to be transacted at the meeting had been received by the Company Secretary, the Meeting proceeded to deal with the formalities of conducting the poll of the AGM.

**ADJOURNMENT OF AGM AND CONDUCT OF POLL**

The Chairman informed Shareholders that all motions tabled at the AGM had been put forth for voting. A briefing on the poll voting procedures was conducted by the Scrutineers. Thereafter, the Shareholders were to cast their votes.

The Shareholders were reminded to complete their poll voting slips and submit them to the Scrutineer. The Chairman further informed Shareholders that the Polling Agent and the Scrutineer would proceed to count and verify the votes cast on the resolutions. Accordingly, the AGM was adjourned at 9.59 a.m. to facilitate vote counting and verification.

**RESULTS OF AGM**

The Chairman informed the Shareholders that the AGM resumed at 10.14 a.m. and announced the results of the poll as follows:

Resolution number and details	Total number of shares represented by votes for and against the relevant resolution	For		Against	
		Number of Shares	As a percentage of total number of votes for and against the resolution (%) <sup>*</sup>	Number of Shares	As a percentage of total number of votes for and against the resolution (%) <sup>*</sup>
<b>Ordinary Resolution</b>					
<b><u>Resolution 1</u></b>					
Adoption of the Judicial Managers' Statement, Audited Financial Statements and Auditors' Report for the financial year ended 30 June 2024	1,025,077,031	1,024,937,031	99.99	140,000	0.01
<b><u>Resolution 2</u></b>					
Adoption of the Judicial Managers' Statement, Audited Financial Statements and Auditors' Report for the financial year ended 30 June 2025	1,025,077,031	1,024,937,031	99.99	140,000	0.01
<b><u>Resolution 3</u></b>					
Re-election of Mr. Yeo Boon Keong <sup>#</sup> as a Director	1,025,077,031	1,024,927,031	99.99	150,000	0.01
<b><u>Resolution 4</u></b>					
Re-appointment of Messrs Forvis Mazars LLP (" <b>Forvis</b> ") as auditors of the Company at a fee to be agreed between the Judicial Manager and Forvis	1,025,077,031	1,024,972,031	99.99	105,000	0.01

*<sup>\*</sup>Based on the results of the poll conducted by the polling agent, the percentage of the total number of votes for and against the resolution is rounded to two decimal places.*

Based on the voting results tabulated, the Chairman declared that the Ordinary Resolutions 1 to 4 tabled at the AGM were duly carried.

**CONCLUSION**

There being no other business to transact, the Chairman declared the AGM of the Company closed at 10.16 a.m. and thanked everyone for their attendance.

**CONFIRMED AS A TRUE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS HELD**

**Mr. Tan Wei Cheong**  
**Joint and Several Judicial Manager**  
**Chairman of the Meeting**