

A.No. 744/25

10.11.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Vikas Yadav, Ld. counsel for the appellant through VC.

This is an appeal challenging the show cause notice dated 03.10.2025, which is not appealable before this Tribunal. The appeal is dismissed with liberty to challenge the demolition order, if any, as per law.

Appeal stands disposed of.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 745/25, 746/25 & 747/25

10.11.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Rajesh Bhatia, Ld. counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submitted that he has applied for regularization of the property.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent through concerned Chief Law officer.

The Executive Engineer (B) is directed to ensure the presence of the concerned AE(B), who shall appear in person along with the record of the proceedings, status report and reply on next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **16.03.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 19.09.2025. However, it is made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected.

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

10.11.2025

A.No. 749/25

10.11.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Deepak Pathak, Ld. counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. Saquib Neshat, Ld. counsel for the appellant in person.

Submissions heard. File perused.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent through concerned Chief Law officer.

The Executive Engineer (B) is directed to ensure the presence of the concerned AE(B), who shall appear in person along with the record of the proceedings, status report and reply on next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **09.12.2025**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 751/25

10.11.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Manoj Kumar, Ld. counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Submissions heard.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent through concerned Chief Law officer.

The Executive Engineer (B) is directed to ensure the presence of the concerned AE(B), who shall appear in person along with the record of the proceedings, status report and reply on next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **09.03.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 23.03.2023. However, it is made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 755/25

10.11.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Jitender Bhardwaj, Ld. counsel for the appellant through VC.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The aforesaid appeal is against the vacation notice dated 19.09.2025, which is not appealable before this Tribunal.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that he has challenged the demolition notice. This is not a d

The appeal is dismissed with liberty to challenge the demolition/ sealing order as per law.

Appeal stands disposed of.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that he has instructions from the appellant to withdraw the aforesaid appeal and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

In view of the submissions made by the Id. counsel for the appellant through VC, the aforesaid appeal is disposed off as withdrawn.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

10.11.2025

A.No. 35/22

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Mahesh Yadav, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to deposit the misuser charges submitted by the respondent on 09.09.2024. More than a year has been passed since then.

The appellant is given last and final opportunity either to argue or to pay the misuser charges on or before the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **02.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 190/25

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Hansdeep Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has filed a compliance affidavit to the effect that he has already deposited the misuser charges, penalty, sealing and desealing charges and further undertakes that he shall not use the property for any other purpose except the residential purposes.

In view of the same, the undertaking is taken on record.

Let the property be de-sealed within 2 weeks from today.

Appeal stands disposed of.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025



A.No. 607/25

10.11.2025

Present :       None for the parties.

As none has appeared despite repeated calls, the matter  
is adjourned.

Put up for further proceeding on **13.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 615/25

10.11.2025

Present : Ms. Sana Ansari, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

It is submitted for the appellant that neither the show cause notice nor the demolition order dated 05.01.2023 was served upon her nor she was given any opportunity of personal hearing.

I have seen the demolition order dated 05.01.2023, wherein the entire property from ground to fifth floor has been mentioned as unauthorized construction.

The appellant is concerned only about the fourth floor.

The demolition order bears the names of Mustaqeen, Aarshat and Irfan. It prima facie appears that the appellant was not given any opportunity of being heard before passing the demolition order. In-facts, the demolition order dated 05.01.2023 in respect of the fourth floor of the property stated to be owned by the appellant Nazia Begum is quashed with directions to the respondent to give personal hearing to the appellant with opportunity to file reply and then pass a speaking order in respect of her property.

...contd.2

: 2 :

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 10.12.2025 at 2.00 pm and after giving personal hearing, a speaking order shall be passed within 6 weeks thereafter.

Appeal stands disposed of.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No 646/25

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Deepak Kumar, Ld. counsel for the appellant through VC.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that connected matters are coming up for hearing on 12.11.2025 and this matter may be put up with those matters.

At request, put up for consideration on **12.11.2025** with connected matter.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 661/25

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Ravi Bassi, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent through concerned Chief Law officer.

The Executive Engineer (B) is directed to ensure the presence of the concerned AE(B), who shall appear in person along with the record of the proceedings, status report and reply on next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **25.03.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 22.08.2025. However, it is made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected.

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

10.11.2025

A.No. 726/25

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. C. Prakash, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Ms. Vasu Singh, Ld. counsel for the respondent through VC.  
Ms. Sarita Gaur, ALO along with Sh. Satish Gautam, AE(B) in person.

Arguments heard. File perused.

Ld. counsel for the appellant is not pressing for interim relief of desealing the property to take out his belongings.

Let the official recorded be submitted on or before the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **16.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 740/25

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Omvir Singh Sisodia, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The aforesaid appeal is against the vacation notice dated 09.10.2025/show cause notice 02.06.2025, which is not appealable before this Tribunal. The appeal is dismissed with liberty to challenge the demolition/ sealing order as per law.

Appeal stands disposed of.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 178/12

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Gaurav Arora, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. Subhash Chand Chandna, SPA holder of the appellants no. 2 and 3 in person  
Sh. S.G. Ashatha and Sh. Sanjay Sharma, Ld. counsel for the DDA.  
Sh. Manish Yadav, Nodal Officer, for the DDA.  
Sh.V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent no. 2.

True copy of the regularization letter dated 11.08.2025 along with regularization plan has already been filed on 09.09.2025.

At this stage, SPA holder of appellant no. 2 and 3 submits that he has instructions from the both appellants to withdraw the aforesaid appeal as the property in question has already been regularized by the concerned authority and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

Statement of SPA holder of the appellant recorded separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by the SPA holder for the appellants, the aforesaid appeal is disposed off as withdrawn.

....contd.2



: 2 :

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

10.11.2025

A.No. 988/14  
Bobby Kumar vs. MCD

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Rajan Chaudhary, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent.  
Sh. Vimal Dhingra, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

Arguments heard at length. Record perused.

Undisputedly, the construction in the property of the appellant is unauthorized construction. Ld. counsel for the appellant has stated that the construction is without any sanction plan as there was no approved colony existing at that time. The only question is whether this construction was raised prior to 01.06.2014 and is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. It is also important whether the status quo as on 01.06.2014 was violated by the appellant or not.

It was also argued by the Id. counsel for the intervener that appellant being the wife of the actual owner has no locus to file this appeal.

I am not inclined to get issue of maintainability of the appeal on the ground that the wife of the owner has filed

...cond.2

: 2 :

this appeal and not the owner as it is the property which is entitled to be protected, if falls within the four corners of National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. The photographs existing in the official record shows that as in August 2014, construction was raised in the property in dispute and the appellant or her husband violated the terms and conditions of status quo as required under the law protecting the unauthorized construction.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has argued that only minor repairs were carried out in the property after 01.06.2014, but the photographs does not support his arguments.

Record further shows that the appellant in the appeal has claimed in para 1(C) that the owner of the property has constructed the building when it was purchased by the husband of the appellant in 2006. However, the relevant documents show that only a plot was purchased and whatever construction is existing, was raised subsequently thereto. The appellant has not filed any documents to show the extent of contraction existing as on 01.06.2014 which can be protected. Otherwise also, the protection is available subject to status quo being maintained of the construction as existing on 01.06.2014

...contd.3

: 3 :

which was violated by the appellant/her husband. There are no merits in the appeal. The appeal is hereby dismissed. Interim order, if any, is hereby vacated. Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 196/15  
Jawahar Singh Vs. MCD

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Pramod Kumar, Ld Proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is held up before the Hon'ble High Court and is not available today.

Similar request was made on the last date of hearing. The case is of 2015 and I am not inclined to adjourn the matter on this ground.

Arguments heard. File perused.

As per the record produced by the respondent, the reply of the appellant dated 14.10.2014 to the show cause notice dated 23.09.2014, which has been filed by the appellant along with the appeal, is not available in the official record.

The status report in this regard dated 22.02.2024 was also filed by the respondent.

Since, the reply of the appellant to the show cause notice is not available in the record, how it was considered by the Quasi Judicial Authority remains unanswered.

...contd.2

: 2 :

In these facts, the matter is remanded back with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply dated 14.10.2014 submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 09.12.2025 at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

Appeal stands disposed of.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 420/18 & 421/18

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for order/judgment on **24.11.2025**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 739/18

10.11.2025

Present :

None for the appellant.

Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

None has appeared for the appellant despite repeated calls since morning, nor cost of Rs. 10,000/- has been deposited.

Despite various calls none is appearing on behalf of the appellant in the Tribunal or through VC.

Put up at 2.00.PM.

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

10.11.2025

At 2.55 pm

Present :

None for the appellant.

Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

None has appeared on behalf of appellant since morning in the Tribunal or through VC despite various calls. Nor the previous cost has been deposited.

It is already 2.55 PM. The present appeal is dismissed in default.

Record of the respondent if any be returned alongwith copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

10.11.2025



A.No. 758/18

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Abhishek Singh and Sh. Karan Chaudhary, Ld  
counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Sanjay Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent along  
with Sh. Ashok Kumar, Sr.Astt. NDMC

Powers in respect of the matters of NDMC not yet  
received.

Put up for arguments on **02.02.2026**, for awaiting powers.  
Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of  
hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 585/19

10.11.2025

Present : Ms. Anamika Ghai, Ms. Nehmat Sethi and Mr. Adnan Nakkash, Ld counsels for the appellant.  
Sh. Sanjay Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Ashok Kumar, Sr. Asstt. NDMC.  
Sh. Sushant Bali, Sh. Praveen and Sh. Deepak Kandpal, Id. counsel for the applicant/proposed R-2.

Reply to the application under Order I rule 10 CPC filed by the appellant. Copy supplied.

Powers in respect of the matters of NDMC not yet received.

Put up for arguments on **09.02.2026**, for awaiting powers.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 174/21

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. D.B. Yadav, Ld. counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Id. counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard. Record perused.

At this stage, Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that he has instructions from the appellants to withdraw the aforesaid appeal and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

Statement of Id. counsel for the appellant recorded separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by the Id. counsel for the appellants, the aforesaid appeal is disposed off as withdrawn.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 359/21

10.11.2025

Manju Tanwar Vs. MCD

Present : Sh. Narender Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld counsel for the respondent.  
Sh. Akash Tanwar, Ld. counsel for the intervener along with intervener.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Arguments heard on the appeal.

The only question involved is whether the fourth floor of the property exists prior to 01.06.2014 to be protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has relied upon a certificate issued to the tenant on the fourth floor, who was a Govt. Employee working with Indian Armed Forces (Indian Navy). This certificate bears the date 01.02.2013.

The respondent MCD was directed to verify this document and upon verification, it was reported that the said certificate has been signed by the then Commander R.P. Gurang, who has now retired from the services, but the certificate itself could not be verified.

...contd.2

: 2 :

If this document bears the signatures of the then Commander R.P. Gurang, issued on 01.02.2013, the same establishes that Mr. Praveen Tiwari was residing as a tenant on the fourth floor of the property no. WZ-26, Ring Road, Narayana Village, Delhi.

On the directions of the court, Mr. Praveen Tiwari also appeared in person on 23.04.2024 when the court was on leave and he filed his affidavit supporting the fact that he was a tenant in 2013 on the fourth floor of this property.

The respondent MCD in the demolition order dated 30.09.2021 did not mention about this document nor it was mentioned that why this document was not considered or if considered, was rejected.

The ground, first, second and third floor of the property have already been protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

It is not the case of the respondent that the appellant has violated the status quo as existing on 01.06.2014. The arguments that she sold half of the property to her sister on 30.04.2013 is also immaterial as she remains owner of half of the property and has every right to challenge the demolition order of the fourth floor.

....contd.3

: 3 :

Since, the appellant has shown that the fourth floor of the property existed prior to 01.06.2014, the same is also entitled to be protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

In-facts, the demolition order dated 30.09.2021 is set aside in respect of the fourth floor of the property till the National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 is in force.

Appeal stands allowed.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 771/22, 789/22 & 772/22

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Vikas Dudeja, Ld counsel for the appellant in appeal no. 789/22.

Ms. Muskan Gupta, Ld. counsel for the appellants in appeal no. 771/22 and 772/22 through VC.

Sh. Ranjeet Pandey, Ld. counsel for the MCD/respondent through VC.

Arguments on the application seeking waiver of cost heard in appeal no. 771/22 and 772/22.

There is no merits in the applications since the cost was imposed not only for delaying the matter, but also for not filing the documents as directed on 30.11.2023. The applications are dismissed being devoid of any merits. Let the cost be paid.

Arguments on the application seeking condonation of delay also heard in appeals no. 771/22 and 772/22.

There is a delay of around 26 days in filing the appeal and the blame as usual has been put on the previous counsel.

Heard. With an endeavour to decide the case on merit, the delay is condoned, subject to cost of Rs. 2,000/- each in appeals no. 771/22 and 772/22 to be deposited with Registry. The applications seeking condonation of delay stand disposed of.

....contd.2

: 2 :

Arguments on the application seeking condonation of delay also heard in appeals no. 789/22.

There is a delay of around 26 days in filing the appeal, which caused as sufficient time has been taken in collecting the documents from House-Tax Department.

Heard. Though, on merit, there are no reason to allow the application, however, with an endeavour to decide the case on merit, the delay is condoned, subject to cost of Rs. 2,000/- in appeal no. 789/22 to be deposited with Registry. The application seeking condonation of delay stand disposed of.

At request, put up for arguments on **13.03.2026**.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025



A.No. 187/23

10.11.2025

Present :       None for the appellant.  
                  None for the respondent.  
                  Sh. Chandra Bhan, Ld. counsel for the intervener through  
                  VC.

As none has appeared for the appellant/respondent, the  
matter is adjourned.

Put up for arguments on the application under I rule 10  
and appeal on **25.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 250/23

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Aman Chauhan, son of the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

The previous counsel has withdrawn his Vakalatnama.  
Son of the appellant seeks some time to engage a new  
counsel.

At request, put up for arguments on **23.03.2026**.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of  
hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 361/23

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Mudabbir Maqsood, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Vijay Tyagi, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An application of the L.Rs of the appellant no. 2 under Order XXII rule 3 CPC seeking their impleadment as well as condonation of delay in filing this application is pending.

One of the L.Rs Ms. Geeta Bambani, is already appellant no. 1. Impleadment of another daughter and son has been sought. The aforesaid applications are allowed. The amended memo is taken on record.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is un-available today due to bad health.

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

Put up for arguments on **25.03.2026**.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 652/23

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Rajeev Chetri, Ms. Meenakshi Rawat and Sh. Pankaj  
Tomar, Ld counsels for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

At request, put up for further arguments on **23.03.2026**.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of  
hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 162/24

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Jitender Sharma, Ld. counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Pranjal Shama, Ld counsel for the respondent no. 1/MCD through VC.  
Sh. Ashish Khatri, Ld. counsel for the respondent no. 2 through VC.  
Sh. Devender, Ld counsel for the respondent no. 2 in person.

Some more time sought on behalf of the respondent no. 2 to file reply to the appeal. It is stated that hard copy of the appeal has not yet been supplied to the counsel.

On the last date of hearing, it was stated for the respondent no. 2 that certified copy has been applied. Certified copy was collected on 01.05.2025 and more than 6 months have already been passed.

Hence, right to file the reply is hereby closed.

Put up for arguments on **07.04.2026**.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 261/24, 262/24 & 263/24

10.11.2025

Present : Ms.Pruna Chaturvedi, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellants.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is un-available today due to some personal difficulty.

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

Put up for purpose fixed on **08.04.2026**.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 527/24

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Roj Malik, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant along with appellant.  
Sh. Ranjeet Pandey, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is un-available today due to ill-health of his mother.

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

Put up for purpose fixed on **09.04.2026**.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 699/24  
Meena Kaushik Vs. MCD

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Puran Singh Mehar, Ld. LAC for the appellant along  
with husband of the appellant.  
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard.

The second floor of Flat no. 4, LIG DDA Flats, Badarpur, New Delhi has been booked and partially demolished vide demolition order dated 28.01.2019.

Appellant has claimed that same is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 being in existence before 07.02.2007. Copies of the house-tax return and some complaints dated 05.01.2006 and 09.01.2006 have been relied upon to show the existence of the second floor.

All the documents were submitted with the respondent along with the reply to the show cause notice, but the demolition order is silent as to why these documents were not considered and if considered, were rejected.

In these facts, the demolition order dated 28.01.2019 is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the documents filed with

....contd.2



: 2 :

the reply to show cause notice, submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 10.12.2025 at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

Appeal stands disposed of.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 88/25

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. R.K. Modi and Ms. Anusueya, Ld counsels for the appellant.

Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent with Sh. Anurag Shandilya, AE(B).

Sh. Suresh Chaudhary, Id. counsel for the private respondents.

Vakalatnama filed on behalf of respondents 2 to 7.

Status report filed by MCD alongwith photographs. Copy supplied.

Brief written submissions filed by the appellants with annexures. Copy supplied.

Arguments heard at length.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present appeal is without merit and dismissed.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 222/25

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Jitender Bhardwaj, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.

Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

At request, put up for arguments on **07.04.2026**.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

10.11.2025

A.No. 353/25 & 354/25

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Ashish, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. Sanjay Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent along  
with Sh. Ashok Kumar, Sr. Asstt. NDMC.

Status report filed. Let the copy of the same be supplied  
to the Id. counsel for the appellant.

Powers in respect of the matters of NDMC not yet  
received.

Put up for arguments on **27.01.2026**, for awaiting  
powers.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of  
hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 357/25

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Sahil Ahuja, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. Abhijeet Singh, Ld. counsel for the appellant in person.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant submits that he has instructions from the main counsel as well as appellant to withdraw the aforesaid appeal and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

Statement of ld. proxy counsel for the appellant recorded separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by the ld. counsel for the appellant, the aforesaid appeal is disposed off as withdrawn.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 385/25

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Gaurav Deshraj, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent joined  
through VC.  
Sh. Pankaj Vivek, Ld counsel for the applicant.

At request, put up for arguments on **07.04.2026**.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of  
hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025

A.No. 444/25 & 449/25

10.11.2025

Present : Sh. Ilesh Shukla, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

At request, put up for arguments on **17.03.2026**.

Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

10.11.2025

A.No. 321/20 & 323/20

10.11.2025

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

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present appeals are devoid of merits and are dismissed.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
10.11.2025