

A.No. 781/25

19.11.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Sanjay Kumar and Sh. Sushil Kumar, Ld. counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The aforesaid appeal is against the vacation notice dated 10.11.2025, which is not appealable before this Tribunal.

At this stage, Id. counsel for the appellant seeks permission to withdraw this petition with liberty to file fresh appeal challenge the demolition/ sealing order as per law.

At request, the appeal stands dismissed as withdrawn.

The appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 783/25 & 784/25

19.11.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. V.K. Mantoo, Ld. counsel for the 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 **06.02.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition orders dated 30.12.2024 and 08.04.2025. 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
19.11.2025

A.No. 785/25

19.11.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Manpreet Singh , 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 **02.03.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 24.05.2018. 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
19.11.2025

A.No. 121/24 (M)

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Amarnath, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent with
Sh. Nishant Rohilla, Adv.

This is an application seeking revival of the appeal. The appeal was disposed of on 09.06.2023 with directions to the appellant to appear before the respondent on a particular day and thereafter, the respondent to pass a speaking order. The appellant in pursuance to this order appeared before the respondent and a fresh speaking order was passed by the respondent. This application seeking revival of the appeal, which has already been decided, is not maintainable. The remedy lies in challenging the fresh order passed by the respondent after remand. The application is dismissed as not maintainable.

File be consigned to Record Room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 283/25

19.11.2025

Present :

None for the appellant.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report already filed by the respondent.

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

19.11.2025

At 2.45 pm

Present :

None for the appellant.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.

None has appeared on behalf of appellant since morning in the Tribunal or through VC despite various calls. None had appeared on behalf of the appellant on the last date of hearing as well.

It is 2.45 pm PM. It appears that the appellant is not interested in pursuing this appeal. 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

19.11.2025

A.No. 601/25

Bhanwar Singh Rajawat Vs. MCD

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Armaan Monga, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Submissions heard. File perused.

The demolition order dated 24.07.2025 records that the reply was received from the appellant to the show cause notice, but same was not found satisfactory. It is non-speaking order as the appellant has a right to know the reasons on which the reply was not found satisfactory. The impugned order does not even mention about the documents filed by the appellant along with reply reflecting that the construction is old.

In these facts, the impugned demolition order dated 24.07.2025 is set aside and the matter is remanded back to the respondent to pass a speaking order after considering the documents submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 17.12.2025 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/19.11.25

A.No. 608/25

19.11.2025

Present : Ms. Sana Ansari, Ld counsel for the 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 **09.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 667/25

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Puran Chand, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashok Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

The record has been produced. It be deposited with Registry.

Status report as well as vakalatnama filed by the MCD. Copy of Status report supplied.

It is stated for the appellant that his regularization application filed online on 28.05.2025, was not considered while passing the demolition order. Except of the pendency of this regularization application, no other ground has been raised in this appeal.

The Respondent is directed to file status report of the regularization application of the appellant on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments 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 17.09.2025. 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
19.11.2025

A.No. 678/25

19.11.2025

Present : Ms. Bhanu Priya, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. R.K. Meena, AE(B).
Sh. Anil Kumar Bhargav, Ld. counsel for the intervener
through VC.
Ms. Sonia, Id. counsel for the intervener.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Reply to the application under Order I rule 10 CPC filed.

Copy supplied.

Arguments on maintainability of the application under order 1 Rule 10 CPC heard. Even if it is presumed that all the averments made in the application is correct, then also in this proceeding between the appellant and the MCD the applicant/intervener has no right to participate and he cannot become a party as there is a clear-cut judgment of Delhi High Court in case ***Hardayal Singh Mehta Vs MCD, AIR 1990 Delhi 170*** in which it is held that in the matter between the appellant and the MCD, no third person can join and become a party to such proceedings and in such proceedings the application under order 1 Rule 10 CPC is not maintainable. Any dispute between the applicant/intervener and the appellant has to be dealt with and to be decided by the

...contd.2

: 2 :

Civil Court separately. Accordingly, application moved by applicant under order 1 Rule 10 CPC is hereby dismissed. However, the applicant/intervener is permitted to file the documents, if any and to orally argue the matter at the final arguments stage.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has filed an urgent application seeking restoration of the electricity connection and for not disconnecting the water connection.

Neither the Delhi Jal Board nor the TPDDL are party before me. The appellant is directed to take steps for impleading them as a party. In the meantime, the appellant shall be at liberty to approach the TPDDL for restoration of the electricity connection and the electricity connection may be restored by the TPDDL subject to deposit of all the necessary charges and dues and the request of MCD to disconnect the electricity connection requested vide letter dated 23.10.2024 shall not be a reason with TPDDL to not to restore the electricity connection in view of the latest circular of Govt. of NCT of Delhi dated 17.11.2025.

The Delhi Jal Board shall also not disconnect the water connection till next date of hearing.

...contd.3

: 3 :

Put up for arguments on appeal on **21.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the sealing order dated 19.06.2025. 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
19.11.2025

A.No. 683/25

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. M.R. Farooqui and Sh. L.S. Farooqui, Id. counsels 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**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 678/16

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Nagender Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.
Sh. Ravi Kumar, AE(B), for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

As per this status report, the size of the shop is 4 feet x 6 feet which is not in compliance to clause no. 7.3 of UBBL 2016 which requires minimum area of shop to be not less than 9 sq.mtrs with minimum width of 2.4 mtrs and minimum height of 2.75 mtrs and maximum height of 4.8 mtrs.

It is submitted by the appellant that she shall not use this shop if desealed and will either sell or purchase the adjoining shop before opening this shop.

Record shows that conversion and misuser charges of this shop of Rs. 10,220/- and Rs. 5170/- have already been deposited by the appellant.

Subject to appellant filing an undertaking with the respondent that she will not use this shop till the same is in compliance of UBBL 2016, the respondent is directed to deseat the property/shop of the appellant within 4 weeks of furnishing of undertaking by the appellant.

...contd.2

: 2 :

The sealing order is however upheld.

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
19.11.2025

A.No. 877/16

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. O.P. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Mahender Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Adjournment sought by the ld. counsel for the appellant on the ground that he is not well.

Similar request was made on 07.02.2025 and none appeared for the appellant on the last date of hearing.

This appeal relates to the year 2016 and till date, even the application seeking condonation of delay in filing the appeal is pending.

The appellant is given last and final opportunity to argue on the appeal as well as on this application on **28.11.2025**.

It is made clear that no further opportunity/adjournment shall be allowed.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 866/18

19.11.2025

Present : Ms. Garima Aggarwal, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant no. 1.
Sh. Ranjit Kumar Singh, Ld. counsel for the appellants no. 2 and 3 through VC.
Ms. Kritika, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

Adjournment sought on behalf of the appellant no. 2 and 3 as well as respondent on the ground that counsel for the respondent is in some personal difficulty whereas counsel for the appellant no. 2 and 3 has to apply for certified copies for the missing documents in the file received from the previous counsel.

In facts, put up for arguments on the appeal as last and final opportunity to all the parties, on **13.01.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 195/20 & 196/20

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Rakesh Tikoo, Ld. Senior counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Nilesh Sahni, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.
Sh. Dharmbir Singh, Consultant for the respondent.

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

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 38/21
Manoj Goel Vs. MCD

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Dinesh Kumar Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant
through VC.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard. File perused.

The Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 26.09.2019 passed in W.P.(C) no. 3462/2016 while disposing of this writ petition, directed the respondent no. 1 to 4 therein who were the govt. bodies, to remove the illegal encroachment after giving adequate opportunity of being heard to the owners/occupants.

The appellant before me was respondent no. 8 before the Hon'ble High Court and his grievance in this appeal amongst other grounds is that the opportunity of being heard was not provided.

The respondent filed status report in compliance to order dated 26.04.2023 of this court on 17.10.2023 through the then Dy. Commissioner concerned. As per the status report, the appellant was not heard in person though his representation and documents were examined.

...contd.2

: 2 :

I am of the opinion that the same is not proper hearing as contemplated by the Hon'ble High Court while disposing of the writ petition as the Hon'ble High Court observed that adequate opportunity of being heard is to be provided. Only by considering the documents, the adequate opportunity could not be provided and therefore, the impugned order dated 01.02.2021 is liable to be set aside for non-compliance of the directions of the Hon'ble High Court. The impugned order is set aside.

The matter is remanded back with directions to the respondent to give opportunity of personal hearing to the appellant after considering his representation and record already submitted and pass a speaking order within 6 weeks after conclusion of personal hearing. Liberty is also granted to the appellant to file any official documents.

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 04.12.2025 at 2.00 pm for personal 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
19.11.2025

A.No. 270/22

19.11.2025

Present : Ms. Vitina Khanna, SPA holder of the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent/MCD.
Sh. Uttam Panwar, Id. counsel for the respondents no. 2
and newly impleaded respondent no. 3 and 6.
Sh. Subhash Chawla, Ld. counsel for the respondent no.
7 through VC.
Clerk for Sh. Subhash Chawla is present in person.

Copy of the amended appeal along with documents
supplied to the respondents no. 2, 3, 6 and 7 through
their counsels today in the court.

None is present for the respondents no. 4 and 5 today.

In the previous order, while allowing the application of the
appellant under Order I rule 10 CPC, the name of newly
impleaded respondent Ajay Kapoor was not mentioned.
Same be now read in the previous order as all the
respondents of the application under Order I rule 10 were
impleaded.

Issue notice of this appeal to the respondents Amandeep
Singh, Sagar Kohli, Prarthna Mehendru, Kapil Kansal and
Mittali Kansal, for next date of hearing.

Let the reply, if any, to the appeal by the newly impleaded
respondent with advance copy to the opposite side.

....contd.2

: 2 :

Put up for reply and arguments on the appeal on
16.01.2026.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 151/23

19.11.2025

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant in person.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Sh. Tarun Gulia, Id. counsel for the intervener through VC with Sh. Vivek Kumar, intervener present in the Court.

Arguments heard on the application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC. Even if it is presumed that all the averments made in the application is correct, then also in this proceeding between the appellant and the MCD the applicant has no right to participate and he cannot become a party as there is a clear-cut judgment of Delhi High Court in case ***Hardayal Singh Mehta Vs MCD, AIR 1990 Delhi 170*** in which it is held that in the matter between the appellant and the MCD, no third person can join and become a party to such proceedings and in such proceedings the application under order 1 Rule 10 CPC is not maintainable. Any dispute between the applicant and the appellant has to be dealt with and to be decided by the Civil Court separately. Accordingly, application moved by applicant under order 1 Rule 10 CPC is hereby dismissed. However, the applicant is permitted to file the documents, if any and to orally argue the matter at the final arguments stage.

....contd.2

: 2 :

Arguments heard on the application seeking condonation of delay The appellant has challenged the demolition order dated 02.02.2022 in this appeal filed on 20.03.2023. As per appellant, he came to know about the demolition order through his tenant residing in the property when official of the respondent visited the premises for demolition action.

In these facts the delay is condoned subject to cost of Rs.2000/- to be deposited with Registry of this Court. The application seeking condonation of delay stands disposed of.

Put up for arguments on appeal on **10.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 02.02.2022. 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
19.11.2025

A.No. 331/23

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Raghunandan Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Subham Sharma, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel is not available today due to some personal difficulty.

In the interest of justice one more opportunity is granted to the respondent to address the arguments in the matter.
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
19.11.2025

A.No. 539/23

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. M.S. Khan, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Shubham Sharma, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.
Sh. A.K. Sharma, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel is not available today due to some personal difficulty.

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

Put up for arguments on **14.01.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 85/23 (M)

Akhtar Ali & Ors Vs MCD

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Virender Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

None for the respondent/MCD.

Sh. G.K. Sharma, Ld. counsel for the applicant/ intervener.

1. This is an application seeking review of the judgment dated 11.05.2022 vide which the matter was remanded back to the respondent with directions to pass speaking order. In the appeal the original appellant had challenged the sealing order passed in respect of property No.115-A, S.P. Land, New Rajdhani Enclave, Delhi.
2. The applicant who was not a party to the appeal has filed this application on 21.12.2023 alongwith application seeking condonation of delay in filing this application. The condonation of delay has been prayed for the reason that the applicant came to know about the decision of this appeal only on 16.07.2023 and thereafter collected documents and filed the review application.
3. Even as per the case of applicant, the applicant had knowledge since 16.07.2023 about this order and this

application filed on 21.12.2023 is barred by limitation and there are no grounds to condone the delay. The application seeking condonation of delay is liable to be rejected.

4. Irrespective of that, there are no merits in this application. The applicant has claimed that the appellant fraudulently obtained orders from this court and has actually encroached upon the land of the applicant. The appellant fabricated documents by demolishing a portion of the wall and gate of the property in dispute and has claimed ownership in the property which actually does not belong to him. A suit for possession filed by the applicant against the appellant is sub-judice. The land is owned by applicant No.1 and since the order dated 11.05.2022 was passed on misrepresentation of facts by the appellant the same should be reviewed.
5. This Court on 11.05.2022 while hearing challenge to a sealing order of the property in dispute was of the opinion that proper hearing was not given to the appellant and therefore, remanded the matter back for fresh adjudication. This Court cannot and did not decide the issue of ownership in the appeal challenging the sealing order. How the applicant is aggrieved by the order dated 11.05.2022 which has not decided the title in the property and otherwise is not an order on merits, remains unexplained during

arguments. The matter was simplicitor remanded back without any opinion on merits or any findings on the possession or ownership of the property. There are no grounds to review the order dated 11.05.2022 nor there is any error apparent on the face of the record to review this order.

6. The application is dismissed.

File be consigned to record room.

**Announced in the Open Court,
Today i.e. on 19.11.2025.**

**(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025**

A.No. 830/23, 831/23 & 18/24

19.11.2025

Present : Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Shubham Sharma, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 830/23 & 831/23.
Sh. S. Adil Hussain, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 18/24.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel has gone to hospital due to some medical emergency.

An adjournment is also sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel is not available today due to ill-health.

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

Put up for arguments on **17.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 842/23

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. V.K. Mantoo, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

This is an application of early hearing filed on behalf of the appellant.

The next date of hearing in the matter is 05.01.2026. The appeal is of the year 2023. In view of the heavy pendency, no early hearing is possible. The application is dismissed. Put up for arguments on the date already fixed i.e. **05.01.2026.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 85/24

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Jitender Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent with
Sh. Pankaj Prasad, JSA.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Part arguments heard.

Let the original house tax file from which these two documents have been photocopied, be produced on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further arguments on **28.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 205/24 & 216/24

19.11.2025

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent
through VC in appeal no. 216/24.
None for the respondent in appeal no. 205/24.

Fresh Vakalatnama filed on behalf of the appellant. Same
are taken on record

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further arguments on **02.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 609/24

19.11.2025

Present : Ms. Vidisha Verma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Rajni, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Amit, Ld. counsel for the intervener through VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is not available today because of death of some relative.

An adjournment is also sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel is not available today because of some personal difficulty.

At request, put up for arguments on **23.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 680/24 & 707/24

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. G.R. Verma, Sh. H.K. Sharma and Sh. Deepak Grover, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Sandeep Singh, SSI, MCD, House-Tax Department.
Ms. Sangeeta, intervener in person.

Part arguments heard.

At request, put up for further arguments on **30.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 938/24

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. G.R. Verma, Sh. H.K. Sharma and Sh. Deepak Grover, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld. counsel for the respondent through VC.
Sh. Aakash , Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

An affidavit along with site plan filed by the appellant.
Copy supplied.

It is submitted by the Id. counsel for the appellant that other owners of the property are not required to be impleaded. Ld. counsel for the respondent submits that they are required to be impleaded.

At request, put up for arguments on **24.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 21/25, 22/25 & 23/25

19.11.2025

Present : None for the appellants.
 Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Id. counsel for the respondent.

None has appeared for the appellant despite repeated calls since morning.

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for arguments on **05.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 28/25
Manju Rawat Vs. MCD

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. R.S. Rawat, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Adarsh Kumar, Ld. counsel for the applicant/
intervener namely Sh. Prem Singh Rawat and Ms.
Yasoda Devi.

Arguments on the application seeking condonation of delay in filing the appeal heard.

As per the appellant, he got the demolition and sealing order only through writ petition filed before the Hon'ble High Court in W.P.(C) no. 16897/2024 vide order dated 06.12.2024. The appeal was preferred on 14.01.2025. With an endeavour to decide the appeal on merit, the delay in filing the appeal is condoned. The application seeking condonation of delay stands disposed of.

The appeal is challenging the demolition and sealing order and the composite appeal challenging these two orders is not maintainable.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that this appeal may be confined only challenging the sealing order dated 11.08.2023 and he seeks liberty to file the separate

...contd.2

: 2 :

appeal challenging the demolition order. In view of the same, this appeal is confined only in respect of sealing order. The liberty as per law is allowed.

Arguments on maintainability of the application under order 1 Rule 10 CPC heard. Even if it is presumed that all the averments made in the application is correct, then also in this proceeding between the appellant and the MCD the applicant has no right to participate and he cannot become a party as there is a clear-cut judgment of Delhi High Court in case ***Hardayal Singh Mehta Vs MCD, AIR 1990 Delhi 170*** in which it is held that in the matter between the appellant and the MCD, no third person can join and become a party to such proceedings and in such proceedings the application under order 1 Rule 10 CPC is not maintainable. Any dispute between the applicant and the appellant has to be dealt with and to be decided by the Civil Court separately. Accordingly, application moved by applicant under order 1 Rule 10 CPC is hereby dismissed. However, the applicant is permitted to file the documents, if any and to orally argue the matter at the final arguments stage.

Put up for arguments on appeal on **06.05.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the

....contd.

: 3 :

impugned order dated 22.07.2024. 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
19.11.2025

A.No. 203/25

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Avinash Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. Nishant Rohilla, Adv.

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further arguments on **15.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken
against the property of appellant in pursuance of the
demolition order dated 24.03.2025. 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
19.11.2025

A.No. 265/25, 269/25, 270/25, 271/25 & 272/25

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. R.K. Arora, Ld counsel for the appellants.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

Ld. counsel for the appellants seeks time to inspect the record submitted on the last date of hearing.

Put up for further arguments on **16.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 359/25

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Suresh Chander and Sh. Sushil Vashisht, Ld
counsels for the appellant.
Sh. S.G. Ashtana, Ld counsel for the respondent.

At request, put up for arguments on **05.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 489/25

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Puran Chand, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Jasleen Kaur, Ld counsel for the respondent through
VC.

Status report filed by the MCD. Copy supplied.

At request, put up for arguments on **05.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025

A.No. 80/23 & 343/24

19.11.2025

Present : Sh. Ashish Chauhan, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 343/24.
Ms. Parveen Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 80/23.

Vide separate common judgment of even date, both the
orders are upheld and both the appeals are dismissed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
19.11.2025