

A.No. 658/24 & 659/24

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Aditya Raj, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.  
Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record  
alongwith Mr. Shubham, JE(B).

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent  
to file status report and record. He submits that JE(B)  
Mr. Shubham has recently joined the office and needs  
some time to inspect the record before filing the  
status report in the matter. Opportunity granted.

Put up for arguments on interim application as well as  
appeal on 04.04.2025.

Interim orders to continue till the next date of hearing.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024

A.No. 203/21

**Mr. Anil Sagar Vs South Delhi Municipal Corporation**

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Mridul Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant  
alongwith appellant in person.

Sh. Varun Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

1. This appeal under Section 347 (B) of the DMC Act has been filed by the appellant against the sealing order dated 07.04.2021, issued by the respondent, pursuant to which, the scooter garage of the appellant of flat No.80-B, (G.F.) DDA Flats, Masjid Moth Phase-II, New Delhi-110048 was sealed for misuse of the property in question.
2. I have heard Ld. counsel for the parties and considered the submissions made.
3. The respondent filed status report today i.e. 26.11.2024, whereby misuse charges to the tune of Rs. 32,499/- were calculated.
4. The respondent has filed another status report today i.e. 26.11.2024, stating therein that the appellant has deposited misuse charges of Rs. 32,500/-, vide G-8-DKL00041 dated 04.11.2024. It is also mentioned in the said status report that property in question has been sealed without any specific reference of Monitoring Committee and the same does not fall under the category of Step-I, Step-II and Step-III.

5. Ld. counsel for the appellant has contended that the appellant has already deposited the misuse charges as calculated by the department, therefore, property may be de-sealed. He further contended that appellant has also filed an affidavit stating therein that he shall not misuse the property in question in future and shall use the same for the purpose of scooter garage only. He prayed that property may be de-sealed.
6. Ld. counsel for the respondent submits that respondent has no objection if property is de-sealed and same is used by the appellant for the purpose of scooter garage.
7. Statement of Sh. Anil Sagar, appellant was recorded on 19.09.2024 wherein he has stated that the deposit of misuse charges will not confer any title on him and he is depositing the misuse charges subject to final decision in Civil Suit CS SCJ 425/2021 titled Radha Kumari Karnam Vs Anil Sagar.
8. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances that the property in question was sealed on account of misuse and that respondent has calculated the total misuse charges for such misuse, which has already been deposited by the appellant with the respondent. The appellant has also undertaken that he will not misuse the premises in question and shall use the same for

9. scooter garage only. Affidavit in this regard has been filed by the appellant in the Court, therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the property of the appellant sealed.
10. I accordingly allow the appeal filed by the appellant. The respondent is directed to de-seal the scooter garage of the appellant of flat No.80-B, (G.F.) DDA Flats, Masjid Moth Phase-II, New Delhi-110048 within a period of one week from today.
11. The appellant is however directed to use the property in question only for scooter garage. The appellant shall not raise any unauthorized construction in the said property.
12. The present appeal filed by the appellant is accordingly disposed off. Record of the respondent if any be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024

A.No. 955/24

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Yashpal Bharti, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Ld. counsel for appellant submits that he has instructions to withdraw the present appeal as the same has been filed against the vacation notice.

Separate statement of the Ld. counsel for appellant has been recorded in this regard.

In view of the facts and circumstances, the appeal filed by the appellant is dismissed as withdrawn.

Appeal file be consigned to record room.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024

A.No. 955/24

26.11.2024

Statement of Sh. Yashpal Bharti, Ld. counsel for  
appellant.

At Bar

I am the counsel for appellant in the present appeal. I  
have instructions to withdraw the present appeal as  
the same has been filed against the vacation notice.  
the same may be dismissed as withdrawn.

RO&AC

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024

A.No. 520/24 & 521/24

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Manoj Kumar and Sh. Ajay Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An application under Order XLI Rule 27 R/w Section 151 CPC moved on behalf of the appellant to place on record the additional documents.

Part arguments on the point of interim application and appeal heard.

At page 69 of the demolition appeal bearing No.521/24, the appellant has placed on record the tax assessment order dated 20.12.2006 which mentions the covered area of the property in question. The appellant is claiming protection in respect of the property on the basis of said document.

Appellant alongwith appeal has also filed an affidavit (from page No.72 to 77) mentioning about the covered area of the property in question.

Ld. counsel for the respondent MCD submits that the protection will not be available in those cases where the status quo has been breached by the appellant after the cutoff date. He submits that in order to appreciate the matter with clarity it will be prudent to get the property inspected and measured to verify the covered area which exists at the spot.

I found merits in the submissions made by Ld. counsel for respondent MCD. In order to appreciate the tax

assessment order (page 69) as well as the affidavit giving details of construction (page 72 to 77 of the appeal) it will be prudent to get the property inspected and measure the covered area. Ld. counsel for appellant does not oppose the same.

Accordingly, a joint inspection of the property be scheduled on 29.11.2024 at 12.00 p.m. The concerned official shall be at liberty to desecrate the property for the purposes of inspection. The property shall be resealed after the inspection is completed. The respondent MCD shall file a status report informing about the status of the covered area of the property on each floor and shall also provide comparative table giving the comparison of the covered area which exist at the spot in comparison to the tax assessment order (page-69) as well as the measurement specified in the affidavit (Page-72 to 77 of appeal).

The SHO concerned is directed to provide necessary assistance to the officers of the MCD for discharging their duties.

Put up for further arguments on interim application as well as appeal on 12.12.2024.

Copy of the order be given dasti.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 J



A.No. 936/24

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Arjun Kasan, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the department, copy supplied.  
Ld. counsel for respondent MCD submits that they will deposit the record during the course of the day.  
Put up for arguments on interim application and appeal on 08.04.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024

A.No. 694/23

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Karanjot Singh Mainee, Ld counsel for the  
appellant joined through VC.  
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent  
No.1.  
Sh. Sagar Shivam Jaiswal, Ld. counsel for R-2 to R-5.

Part arguments on application seeking condonation of  
delay heard.

Ld. counsel for appellant seeks an adjournment to file  
additional documents in support of their application  
especially the record pertaining to the civil case.

Advance copy be supplied to the opposite party.

Put up for further arguments on application seeking  
condonation of delay and appeal on 19.03.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 J

A.No. 153/23

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Yash Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments on application seeking condonation of delay heard.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that earlier the father of the appellants was pursuing the present matter who died on 22.03.2022. He submits that appellants came to know about the present proceedings only when the vacation notice dated 13.03.2023 was affixed at their property. He submits that thereafter the appellant sought legal advice and filed Appeal No. 134/2023 impugning the vacation notice. The said appeal was withdrawn later on and the present appeal was filed on 21.03.2023. He submits that due to lack of knowledge about the proceedings, the appellant could not pursue any legal recourse. He submits that appellants are using the property in question for residential purposes and have challenged the demolition order and in case no opportunity of defending is granted, they will suffer irreparable loss. He submits that the appellants have disputed receiving / signatures on the demolition order.

Ld. counsel for respondent MCD opposes the application. He submits that father of the appellants

Contd.....-2

:: 2::

appeared before the Quasi Judicial Authority and also filed a reply dated 24.07.2019. He submits that demolition order was also served upon one of the appellants bearing their signatures.

Arguments heard and record perused. The appellants have impugned the demolition proceedings in the present matter. Perusal of the record shows that the reply dated 24.07.2019 was submitted to the MCD by the father of the appellant who is stated to have been died on 22.03.2022. The appellants have disputed their signatures / receiving on the demolition order. It is the case of the appellants that they came to know about the present proceedings only when the vacation notice was affixed on their property. The appellants have impugned the demolition order in respect of the property in question where they are residing and in case opportunity of hearing is not provided, they will suffer irreparable loss. Appellants have raised the grounds which need to be adjudicated on merits. Therefore, the application for condonation is allowed and delay is condoned.

It is argued by Ld. counsel for the appellants that the property is an old and protected under the National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision)

Contd...../3

Second Amendment Act, 2011. The appellants are relying upon the Property Tax Returns for the year 2007-2008 in which the covered area of the property in question is mentioned.

Ld. counsel for respondent MCD submits that they need to verify the said tax record. He submits that the property in question was booked for carrying out further construction in the property and due to which status quo has been breached and the protection under the National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 is not available.

Both the parties agree that a joint inspection of the property in question be carried out to ascertain the covered area of all the floors in building so that the same can be compared with the area shown in the property tax returns for the year 2007-2008.

Accordingly, a joint inspection of the property be scheduled on 03.12.2024 at 12.00 p.m. The respondent MCD shall file a status report informing about the status of the covered area of the property on each floor and shall also provide a comparative table given the comparison of the area which exist at the

Contd...../4

:: 4::

spot in comparison to the property tax return for the year 2007-2008.

The SHO concerned is directed to provide necessary police assistance to the officers of the MCD for discharging their duties.

Put up for arguments on interim application as well as on the point of appeal on 24.01.2025.

Copy of this order be given dasti.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 (s)

A.No. 709/22

26.11.2024

Present : Ms. Risha Mittal proxy counsel for the appellant joined through VC.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

None has appeared for R-2 in the present case.

The appellant has impugned the order dated 11.07.2022 wherein the protection under the National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act has been granted in favour of R-2. Before reserving the verdict in the present matter it is necessary to hear the version of R-2 in the present matter.

Perusal of the record shows that Clerk of Ms. Aditi Aggarwal Ld. counsel for R-2 appeared on 13.09.2024 and sought adjournment.

It is already 1.25 p.m. and none is appeared on behalf of R-2.

In the interest of justice R-2 is given one last and final opportunity to address the arguments in the present matter subject to adjournment cost of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited with the Registry of this Tribunal. It is clarified that in case the R-2 does not appear and argue the matter on the next date of hearing, the Tribunal shall be constrained to proceed further in the matter as per law.

Re-list for further arguments on the point of appeal on  
04.04.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 J



A.No. 325/15

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Sunil Sachdeva, Ld counsel for the appellant  
alongwith Mr. Madan Lal Grover, in person.  
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An application under Section 151 CPC is moved on behalf of Mrs. Vijaya Grover seeking permission to add herself as appellant No.2 in the present matter.

Appellant Madan Lal Grover submits that he has no objection to the application.

It is submitted that the sealing as well as demolition order were passed against Mrs. Vijaya Grover and the sealing order in the present case is impugned only by her husband Mr. Madan Lal Grover. It is submitted that impleadment of Mrs. Vijaya Grover is necessary in this case because impugned order has been passed against her.

Ld. counsel for applicant submits that Mrs. Vijaya Grover shall remain bound by the pleadings already made in the appeal by her husband Mr. Madan Lal Grover.

Ld. counsel for respondent MCD submits that the application may be decided as per law.

Arguments heard. Record perused. Perusal of the record shows that show cause notices of impugned demolition order as well as sealing order have been

addressed to Mrs. Vijaya Grover. She is stated to be owner of one of the flat against which the allegations of unauthorized construction by way of amalgamation are made. In these circumstances, it is clear that she is necessary party in the present matter. Appellant Mr. Madan Lal Grover submits that he has no objection in case she is impleaded as appellant No.2 in this case.

Accordingly this application is allowed and Mrs. Vijaya Grover is impleaded as appellant No.2 in the present matter. Amended memo of parties is taken on record. In respect of other application under Section 151 CPC seeking amendment of appeal is concerned, Ld. counsel for applicant/appellant submits that they will file a separate appeal impugning a demolition order in respect of property in question and seeks permission to withdraw the said application. Accordingly, the application under Section 151 CPC seeking amendment in the appeal is dismissed as withdrawn. Put up for arguments on interim application as well as appeal on 04.04.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 J

A.No. 449/23

26.11.2024

Present : Proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Dharambir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed on behalf of respondent department informing that regularization application has been dismissed. Copy supplied.

Adjournment is sought on behalf of appellant as main counsel Sh. Yogesh Gaur is not available today being busy in a matter before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

In the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted to appellant to address arguments.

Put up for arguments on interim application and appeal on 04.04.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk

A.No. 50/19 & 263/17

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Vikhyat Oberoi, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.  
Sh. Jasman Singh Sethi, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Ashok Kumar, Nodal officer.

The notification regarding New Delhi Municipal Council conferring the powers to the undersigned has not yet been received and same is still awaited.

Put up for consideration on 25.03.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024

A.No. 364/24

26.11.2024

Present : Ms. Sarita Dixit , Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Reply to the application under Section 5 of Limitation Act is filed on behalf of respondent. Copy supplied.

Ld. counsel for appellant submits that they want to peruse the reply before addressing arguments in the matter.

Put up for arguments on the application seeking condonation of delay, interim application and appeal on 14.02.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk

A.No. 175/24

26.11.2024

Present : Ms. Savita Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Pritiesh Sabbharwal, Ld. Counsel for the respondent.  
Sh. M.F.Khan , Ld counsel for the respondent no.2 & 3.

Reply to the application of the appellant for filing additional documents on record is filed on behalf of respondent, MCD.

Ld. counsel for respondent nos. 2 & 3 submits that due to some personal difficulty, he does not wish to pursue the present matter.

Ld. counsel for respondent no.3 does not object to the same and seeks a short adjournment to engage a new counsel in the matter.

Accordingly, put up for arguments on the application seeking condonation of delay as well as application filing additional documents on 21.01.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk

A.No. 1024/24, 1025/24 & 1026/24

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Nitesh Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.

Sh. Jasman Singh Sethi, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Srinivas, AE(B).

An adjournment is sought on behalf of respondent, MCD to file status report as well as record in the matter. Ld. counsel for respondent submits that he is yet to receive copy appeal and he is not in a position to argue the matter today.

Ld. counsel for appellant submits that interim protection be granted till next date of hearing.

Ld. counsel for respondent, MCD opposes the request. He submits that interim application be decided on merits.

Sh. Srinivas, AE(B) present in the Tribunal submits that department will not take any coercive action against the property till next date of hearing.

At joint request of parties, put for arguments on interim application and appeal on 05.12.2024.

Copy of order be given dasti.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk

A.No. 62/23

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Varun Bhandari, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent  
along with AE(B).

Mr. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld. counsel for respondent, MCD seeks an adjournment to take instruction from the department to file status report. In the past also various adjournments have already been granted to the MCD to file status report in the matter. But despite that report has not been filed so far.

Ld. counsel for appellant objects the request for another adjournment and submits that appellant is suffering as his property is lying sealed.

In the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is granted to the respondent, MCD to file status report in the matter clarifying the issue, failing which the Tribunal shall be constrained to summon the concerned senior officer to seek their assistance in the matter.

Put up for further proceedings on 20.12.2024.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk



A.No. 336/24

26.11.2024

Present : Ms. Marveen Dhanjal , Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC along with Sh. Akshay Daniel, Advocate present in the Tribunal.

Ms. Bhavya Chauhan , Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Abdul Majid & Sh. Sanjiv Kumar, AEs(B) .

Status report is filed on behalf of respondent department. Copy supplied. It is informed that the area as per sale deed of flat in question is 75 sq.mtrs. The total covered area at site is 107.85 sq.mtrs.

Ld. counsel for respondent, MCD submits that in the property tax return filed by appellant (at page 40-41 of the appeal) the total covered area in the year 2006-07 is shown as 88 sq.mtrs. He submits that it is clear from the admitted documents of the appellant that they have breached the status quo by erecting unauthorized construction over and above the covered area as shown in the property tax return filed in the year 2006-07. He submits that as the status quo had been breached after the cut off date by carrying out the unauthorized construction, interim protection is liable to be vacated.

On the other hand, an adjournment is sought on behalf of appellant as the main counsel Mr. Ankush Narang is not available today due to death his relative. In the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is granted to appellant to address arguments.

Concerned AEs(B) are directed to remain present in person before the Tribunal on the next date of hearing. Put up for arguments on interim application seeking stay and appeal on 17.12.2024.

Interim orders to continue till the next date of hearing.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk

A.No. 609/24

26.11.2024

Present :

Sh. Raghav Saluja , Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Madan Sagar , Ld counsel for the respondent.  
Sh. Amit Chaubey, Ld. counsel for the Intervener Sh.  
Prem Raj.

Part arguments on the application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC heard. Some clarifications are required from appellant in respect of title and occupation of property in question.

Appellant is directed to appear in person for recording his statement before the Tribunal on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further arguments on application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC, interim application and appeal on 07.02.2025.

Interim orders to continue till the next date of hearing.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk

A.No. 426/24

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. M.F.Khan, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Ms. Renu Soni, Nodal Officer on behalf of the  
respondent / MCD.  
Ms. Savita Rastogi, Ld. counsel for the Intervener.

Put up for the purpose already fixed on 21.01.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024

A.No. 199/24

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi , Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh.Beena Pandey, Ld counsel for the respondent  
along with Sh. Lekh Raj, AE(B).

Arguments on application under Section 343(2) DMC Act read with Section 5 of Limitation Act heard.

Ld. counsel for appellant submits that impugned order dated 29.02.2024 was served upon them on 07.03.2024. After that appellant contacted their counsel who prepared the appeal and present appeal was filed on 15.03.2024.

Ld. counsel for respondent, MCD opposes the application.

Arguments heard and record perused. Perusal of MCD record prima-facie shows that there is no service report of demolition order on the file. Under these circumstances, the averments made in the appeal regarding service of demolition order dated 07.03.2024 has remained unrebutted. Appellant has impugned the demolition order in the present case and has raised the ground which needs to be considered on merits. At this juncture, appellant is able to show sufficient cause seeking condonation of delay. Application for seeking condonation of delay is allowed, delay is condoned.

Ld. counsel for respondent, MCD submits that she needs some time to inspect the record and to take instruction from the department before addressing arguments in the present matter.

Put up for arguments on interim application and appeal on 07.04.2025.

Interim orders to continue till the next date of hearing.

It is clarified that the observations made while passing of this order by this Court shall not tantamount to the expression on the merits of this case.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk

A.No. 476/17, 510/17, 461/17 & 500/17

26.11.2024

Present : None for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no.476/15.  
Sh. H.R.Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal nos.510/17, 461/17 & 500/17.  
Sh. Namrah Nasir, Proxy counsel for Sh. Jaspal Singh, Ld. counsel for the Intervener Ms. Kiran Khanna.

None has appeared on behalf of appellant in Court or on VC in the present matter.

In the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted to appellant to address arguments in the matter, failing which the Tribunal shall be constrained to proceed further as per law.

Put up for the purpose already fixed on 04.04.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk

A.No. 683/15 & 684/15

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Gaurav Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.

Sh. H.R.Aggarwal , Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no.683/15.

Ms. Manjusha Jha, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no.684/15.

It is informed that other connected cases are already listed before the Tribunal on 18.03.2025.

Accordingly, matter be relisted for the purpose already fixed with connected cases on 18.03.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024



A.No. 615/18, 866/17 & 222/17

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K.Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in  
appeal nos. 866/17 & 222/17.  
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent  
in appeal no.615/18.

Part arguments heard.

It is already lunch time.

Ld. counsel for appellant submits that he is not  
available in post lunch session.

Accordingly, relist the matter for further arguments on  
the point of appeal on 07.04.2025.

Interim orders to continue till the next date of hearing.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk

A.No. 42/23

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Manish Dua, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Anubhav Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent  
along with Sh. Vinod Bansal, AE(B).

Status report is filed on behalf of respondent  
department. Copy supplied.

Part arguments heard.

The then concerned EE(B), AE(B) and JE(B) are  
directed to remain present in person before the  
Tribunal on the next date of hearing.

The representative from Building Department (HQ) is  
also directed to appear in person before the Tribunal  
on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further arguments on the point of appeal on  
29.11.2024.

Copy of order be given dasti.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk

A.No. 551/19

26.11.2024

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. H.R.Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

It is already lunch time.

Ld. counsel for appellant submits that he is not available in post lunch session.

Accordingly, relist the matter for further arguments on the point of appeal on 07.04.2025.

(ABHILASH MALHOTRA)  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
26.11.2024 rk