

A.No. 802/25 : Surender Kumar Vs. MCD
A.No. 803/25 : Kamal Kumar Sharma vs. MCD
A.No. 804/25 : Desh Raj Vs. MCD
A.No. 805/25 : Sanjay Arora Vs. MCD

02.12.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Hinu Mahajan, Ld. counsel for the appellants in appeal no. 804/25 & 805/25 and Ld. proxy counsel in other two appeals.

Submissions heard. Files perused.

In the aforesaid appeals, the demolition order(s) dated 14.11.2025 is under challenge on the ground that the reply of the appellants to the show cause notice dated 15.09.2025 submitted on 14.10.2025 was not considered.

Record shows that appellant was asked to give reply to the show cause notice dated 15.09.2025 within 15 days. The same was replied on 14.10.2025. It is the case of the appellant that the show cause notice was not served in time after 15.09.2025. The impugned demolition order dated 14.11.2025 records that no satisfactory reply has been received. It appears that the reply of the appellant, even if filed late, was not considered before passing the demolition order dated 14.11.2025.

...contd.2

: 2 :

In these facts, the demolition order(s) dated 14.11.2025 is/are set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply dated 14.10.2025 submitted by the appellants and after giving personal hearing to the appellants. The appellants shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on **05.01.2026** at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

All the aforesaid appeals are allowed.

Appeal files be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 809/25

02.12.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Manish Bhardawaj and Sh. Pradyot Pravash, Ld. counsels for the appellant.

Ms. Rashi Bansal, Ld. counsel for the respondent no. 2 to 6 through VC.

Submissions heard. File perused.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent no. 1/MCD 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.

Ms. Rashi Bansal, advocate accepts the notice on behalf of the respondent no. 2 to 6.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **05.12.2025**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 812/25

02.12.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Alok Kumar, 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.

Appellant seeks time to file the documents to show that there was existing construction when he purchased the property in October 2024.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **17.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 324/21, 325/21

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Karan Singh Uniyal, Ld. Proxy counsel for the
appellant in 324/21.

None for the appellant in appeal no. 325/21.

None for the respondents.

Files in aforesaid appeals 324/21 and 325/21 are stated
to be before the Ld. Appellate court.

Let the files be awaited for **25.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 432/21 & 433/21

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Karan Singh Uniyal, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant in 432/21 & 433/21.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 432/21 & 433/21.

These two cases were adjourned only simplicitor for the reason that the files of two appeals 324/21 and 325/21 are before the Ld. Appellate court.

Files of these two cases are available with this court and the appellant is enjoying the benefit of status quo order dated 06.12.2021 in both these appeals.

These appeals are to be listed separately.

Applications seeking condonation of delay in filing these appeals are pending till date.

Put up for arguments on these applications and interim applications on **16.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 776/25

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Manuj Agarwal , Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. K.D. Sharma , Ld counsel for the respondent/DDA.

Memo of appearance filed for the DDA.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has placed on record the copy of the minutes dated 24.11.2025 and Joint Inspection Report dated 27.11.2025, which show that the property of the appellant is separate from the '*Takiya Talab*' which is part of khasra no. 373/1. Copy of the same supplied.

Ld. counsel for the DDA seeks time to verify and file the report.

In view of this Joint Inspection Report, the impugned order dated 09.10.2025 bearing no. F/4(20)/AE(P)/DPD-I/DDA/2025-26/659 is stayed till next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **13.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 806/25

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Shivam Singh Baghel and Ms. Himani Kalra Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Sanjay Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent no. 1/DDA along with Sh. Rahul Kannugo and Sh. Kapil, Patwari.

Memo of appearance filed on behalf of the respondent/DDA and time sought to file the record

DSI IDC is another respondent in this case, but notice has not been issued to it. Let the notice be issued to the DSI IDC for the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **12.12.2025**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 28.08.2024. 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
02.12.2025

A.No. 374/11, 375/11 & 394/13

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Ashish Kumar Bhagat, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. A.L. Agnihotri, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. Manish Rajpal, Asstt. Town Planner, MCD.

As per the status report filed on the last date of hearing,
the appellants gave a reply on 23.10.2025 which was
under scrutiny to be placed before the Layout Scrutiny
Committee.

The Town Planning Department is required to inform the
court as to what further development has happened after
23.10.2025. Let the same be placed in the court by
tomorrow.

At request, put up for arguments on **03.12.2025**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 727/14 & 752/14

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Atul Sharma, Ld. counsel for the appellant in appeal no. 727/14.
Sh. Mahendra Sharma and Sh. Himanshu Wadhwa, Ld. counsel for the appellant in appeal no. 752/14 along with appellant.
Sh. Nilesh Sahni, Ld counsel for the respondent no. 1 through VC.
Sh. Dharambir Singh, Consultant, NDMC in person
Sh. Sanjay Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent no. 2.

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

Put up for arguments on **16.02.2026**, for awaiting powers.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 437/15
Snehlata and Ors. Vs. MCD

02.12.2025

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

Arguments heard. File perused.

The appellants amongst other grounds have challenged the demolition order on the ground that no opportunity of personal hearing was given to them.

The office file shows that the show cause notice and the demolition order was sent by post to the owner without mentioning the name and particulars.

It appears that fair opportunity of giving reply and personal hearing was not given to the appellants.

In these facts, the demolition order dated 26.02.2015 is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply and documents submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant.

It has also been informed that the regularization application of the appellant is also pending with the respondent since almost 3 years. The respondent is directed to decide that application as well within 6 weeks after conclusion of the personal hearing in this case.

...contd.2

: 2 :

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 15.12.2025 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
02.12.2025

A.No. 977/15 & 978/15

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Chirau Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Written submissions filed by the appellant.

Arguments heard.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the aforesaid appeals stand 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
02.12.2025

A.No. 862/16

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Awijit Paliwal, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments on the point of appeal heard from both the parties at length.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present appeal is dismissed.

Record of the respondent (if any), 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
02.12.2025

A.No. 27/17
Amit Gupta Vs. MCD

02.12.2025

Present : Sh.M.S. Khan, Ld. counsel for appellant joined through
VC.
Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld. counsel for respondent.

Arguments heard.

This is an appeal challenging the sealing order dated 26.12.2016 and same records that the owner/occupier failed to file any reply.

During the course of arguments, it was argued for the appellant that his reply dated 23.12.2016 filed along with the appeal to the show cause notice dated 20.12.2016 duly received, was not considered. This reply is not available in the sealing file and in-facts, the sealing order was passed without considering the reply received on 23.12.2016 and without giving an opportunity of hearing to the appellant. Same is liable to be set aside for violation of principles of natural justice.

In facts, the Sealing order dated 26.12.2016 is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply dated 23.12.2016 submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear

...contd.2

: 2 :

before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 05.01.2026 at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

The 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
02.12.2025

A.No. 342/17
Amit Gupta Vs. MCD

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld. counsel for respondent.

Arguments heard.

This is an appeal against demolition and the appellant has claimed that the second and third floor of the property which are in dispute, are old and existing since 2001 and only some minor repairs were carried out including the change of roof which was in dilapidated condition pursuant to the permission granted by the respondent. Reliance in this regard was placed on house-tax inspection report on page no. 45 and 46 of the appeal. The appellant despite opportunity did not file the original of these documents. The original office file was summoned and page no. 46 is not available in the original office file. However, since the regularization appeal has been remanded back, outcome of the regularization application will have bearing on the outcome of this appeal also.

Be awaited for the result of the regularization application on **18.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 748/24
Amit Gupta Vs. MCD

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. Krishan Kumar, AZI from house-tax department.

Arguments heard at length.

This is an appeal relating to rejection of regularization application of the appellant. Vide this appeal, the impugned order dated 22.03.2023 is being challenged on the ground that the ownership documents of the appellant along with indemnity bond were not considered. The appellant has drawn my attention to the ownership documents which relates back to 1910 which were in favour of M/s Sirdar Carbonic Gas Company Ltd. This company was the original lessee of the entire property bearing no. 9061, Ward no. XII, Naya Mohalla, Rambagh Road, Pul Bangash, Delhi. Sale deed was executed by this company in favour of the father and paternal uncle of the appellant. Later on, paternal uncle Mr. Umesh Kumar relinquished his share to his brother Rakesh Kumar, who is the father of the appellant. Mr. Rakesh Kumar passed away and his legal heirs relinquished their share in respect of the said property in favour of the

...contd.

: 2 :

appellant making him the sole owner of the property. The documents coupled with the indemnity bond are sufficient to show the ownership of the property.

In any case, the respondent by sanctioning the building plan are not conferring any ownership right and the sanctioned building plan is also subject to the indemnity bond furnished by the appellant.

In-facts, the regularization appeal is allowed and respondent is directed to reconsider the application without insisting for any other ownership document. The appellant however, shall comply with the other formalities to be raised by the respondent through a valid notice, if any left. The regularization application be reopened and decided within 8 weeks from today.

With the above observations, the 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
02.12.2025

A.No. 284/20

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Shubham Kaushik, 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 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.

At request, put up for arguments on **06.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 170/22, 259/22, 372/22 & 378/23

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rahul, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellants.
Sh. Sahib Gurdip Singh, Ld. counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 378/23.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 170/22 and 259/22.
None for the respondent in appeal no. 372/22.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as
main counsel is not 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.

At request, put up for arguments on **20.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 156/23

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Bharat Deep Singh , Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent
along with Sh. Vipin Gosain, AE(B)

Status report is filed by the MCD in respect of third and fourth floor of the property. The total covered area of the third floor is 86.91 sq. mtrs. However, unauthorized construction still exists on the fourth floor. The appellant disputes the same and claims that unauthorized construction on the fourth floor except the mumty has been demolished.

MCD is directed to inspect the fourth floor and if there is any unauthorized construction except mumty on the fourth floor, let the same be demolished and status report along with photographs be filed on or before the next date of hearing.

At request, put up for arguments on **18.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 222/23

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rishab Jain, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent through VC.
Sh. Sudhir Tyagi, Ld. proxy counsel for the intervener.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is help up before the Hon'ble High Court.

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

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
02.12.2025

A.No. 407/23 & 179/24

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Harsh Bansibal, Ld. counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 179/24.
Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Ld. counsel for the appellant in
appeal no. 407/23 thorough VC

At request, put up for arguments on **04.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 448/23

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Somesh Khomka, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant through VC.

Sh. Pulkit Garg , Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel has been suffering from high fever and is not available today.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **08.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 476/23 & 513/23

02.12.2025

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

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is not available today because of hospitalization of his mother.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **25.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 623/23

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Ram Kishan, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent
along with Sh. Mehboob, AE(B).

Part augments heard.

The appellant has raised an issue of jurisdiction of the respondent in issuing the impugned sealing order.

Before approaching this tribunal, the appellant filed writ petition bearing no. 11015/2019 before the Hon'ble High Court. In that writ petition, in para 4, the Hon'ble High Court has already observed that as far as the unauthorized construction on the property is concerned, the respondent/MCD does have jurisdiction.

In view of this observation of the Hon'ble High Court, the question of jurisdiction of the respondent does not survive.

Put up for arguments on the application seeking condonation of delay and appeal on **19.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 716/23
Laxmi Sharma Vs. MCD

02.12.2025

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. proxy counsel for 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
02.12.2025

At 2.35 pm
Present :

None for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. proxy 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 previous date as well.
It is already 2.35 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
02.12.2025

A.No. 816/23

Nitin Chopra Vs. MCD

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Suresh Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard on the appeal.

The impugned demolition order dated 28.11.2023 passed in respect of the entire property from basement to second floor and four rooms at the third floor, is under challenge on the ground that the servant quarter on the third floor i.e. the roof of the second floor is existing at least since 02.07.2003 when the father of the appellant had purchased half basement and a servant quarter on the roof of the second floor.

The sale deed in this regard has been placed on record which shows that the father of the appellant purchased half portion of the basement along with servant quarter with common toilet on the top floor.

Para 9 of this sale deed clearly says that if the owner of the roof of the second floor desires to construct third floor, he will shift the servant quarter to the roof of the third floor. This sale deed is sufficient to establish that the servant quarter on the third floor i.e. roof of the second

...contd2

: 2 :

floor are in existence at least since July 2003 and are protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011

The impugned order is kept in abeyance till the National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 is in force.

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
02.12.2025

A.No. 123/14

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Anupam Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

At request made on behalf of the appellant, put up for arguments on **27.02.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 322/24

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Shreshtha Raj Srivavasta, Ld. proxy counsel for the
appellant through VC.
Sh. Chetan Hasija, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as
main counsel is not available today due to ill-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 **22.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 353/24

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

At request, put up for arguments on **20.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 400/24

02.12.2025

Present : Appellant in person.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as counsel is not available today because of marriage of his daughter in Jaipur, Rajasthan.

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

In the meantime, issue notice to the respondent no. 2 for the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **22.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 662/24

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Chetan Hasija, Ld counsel for the respondent.

At request, put up for arguments on **21.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 687/24

02.12.2025

Present : Appellant in person.
Sh.Pulkit Garg , Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is not available today due to marriage of his daughter.

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 **21.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 695/24

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh.Pulkit Garg , Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

At request, put up for arguments on **19.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 998/24

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

At request, put up for arguments on **20.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 8/25 (M)

02.12.2025

Present : None for the appellant/applicant.
 Sh. Prithish Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

This is an application seeking restoration of the appeal dismissed for non-prosecution on 24.02.2025. The application was filed on 24.03.2025 stating that the counsel assured the appellant that he will appear diligently, but failed to appear.

In view of the same, the application is allowed subject to cost of Rs. 5,000/- to be deposited with Registry.

The appeal be restored to its original number.

Put up for arguments on the appeal on **13.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 360/25
Murari Lal Vs. MCD

02.12.2025

Present : None for the appellant.

Sh. Apoorv Sisodia, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

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

02.12.2025

At 2.45 pm

Present : None for the appellant.

Sh. Apoorv Sisodia, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

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 previous date as well.

It is already 2.45 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

02.12.2025

A.No. 491/25

02.12.2025

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

Respondent has not filed the fresh photographs as directed on the last date of hearing. Let the same be filed with the directions to the AE(B) to be present on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **03.02.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
02.12.2025

A.No. 71/19, 119/19 & 338/19

02.12.2025

Present : None for the appellants.
 Sh. V.K. Aggarwal and Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsels
 for the respondent.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the aforesaid
appeals are dismissed.

Record of the respondent (if any), 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
02.12.2025