

A.No. 865/25

22.12.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Ganpat Ram, 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 **02.06.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 30.09.2025. However, it is made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected. The appellant is directed not to raise any further construction in the property in question.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 867/25

22.12.2025

Fresh appeal filed. Be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Mukesh Bhardwaj, 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 **23.01.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 08.12.2025. However, it is made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected. The appellant is directed not to raise any further construction in the property in question.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 29/25 (M)

22.12.2025

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

Submissions heard. File perused.

This is an application seeking restoration of the appeal which was dismissed in default.

Let notice of this application be issued to the respondent for **09.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 30/25 (M)

22.12.2025

Present : Ms. Kajal, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

Submissions heard. File perused.

This is an application seeking restoration of the appeal which was dismissed in default.

Let notice of this application be issued to the respondent for **06.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 735/16 & 23/18

22.12.2025

Present : Ms. Sana Ansari, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld counsel for the respondent  
through VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant  
on the ground that case file is not traceable.

The matter pertains to the year 2016 and 2018.  
However, in the interest of justice one last and final  
opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the  
arguments in the matter subject to cost of Rs. 2,500/-  
in each appeal to be deposited with Registry.

Put up for arguments on **23.02.2026**. It is made clear  
that no adjournment shall be allowed on the date  
fixed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 881/17, 910/17, 566/18 & 138/23

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. H. Rehman, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Mustaq Ahmad, father/attorney for appellant  
Mohsin in appeal no. 881/17 & 566/18  
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent  
in appeal no. 566/18 & 910/17.  
Sh. Sanjay Sethi, Ld counsel for the respondent in  
appeal no. 881/17 through VC.  
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld. counsel for the respondent in  
138/23.  
Sh. V.V. Singh, Ld. counsel for the respondent/Delhi  
Waqf Board in appeal no. 881/17 & 910/17

An adjournment is sought by Id. counsel for appellant  
on the ground that he is not feeling well today.

In the interest of justice one last and final opportunity  
is granted to the appellants to address the arguments  
in the matter.

Put up for arguments on **10.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 267/18

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Abhinav Agarwal, Sh. Piyush Bhardwaj and Sh. Shivam Gupta, Ld. counsels for the appellant.  
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard on appeal.

Put up for further arguments on **19.01.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 653/18 & 851/18

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Surender Chauhan, Ms. Kashika Kapoor, and Mr. Shubham Joshi, Ld. counsels for the appellant along with appellant.  
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 653/18, & 851/18.

As per status report dated 15.04.2025 the respondent has reserved the matter for consideration of the sanctioned building plan of the appellant for orders. Ld. counsel for respondent is not aware whether the order have been passed or not.

Respondent is directed to file status report about the outcome of application for regularization which was remanded back on 29.11.2024 in appeal No.852/18.

Let the same be filed on or before the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **27.01.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025



A.No. 599/18

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Surender Chauhan, Ms. Kashika Kapoor, and Mr. Shubham Joshi, Ld. counsel for the appellant along with appellant.  
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld proxy counsel for Sh. H., R. Aggarwal Ld. counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. H.R. Aggarwal 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 purpose fixed on **27.01.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 700/18 & 499/23

22.12.2025

Present : None for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, 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  
22.12.2025

Present : None for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, 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 last two dates as well.

It is 03.40 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  
22.12.2025

A.No. 113/21 & 220/22

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Ram Niwas Singh Tomar, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 220/22.

None for the respondent in appeal no. 113/21.

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

Even none has appeared for the respondent today in appeal no. 113/21.

In the interest of justice one last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **01.06.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 739/22

22.12.2025

Present :           None for the appellant.  
                  Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.  
                  Sh. Dishant Sharma, Ld. counsel for the respondent  
                  no. 2 to 4 through VC.

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for arguments as last and final opportunity to the appellant to advance arguments on **08.07.2026**. It is made clear that no further adjournment shall be granted on the date fixed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

At this stage, Sh. Rajiv Gupta, Ld. counsel for the appellant has appeared in the court and is apprised about the today's order.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 664/23

22.12.2025

Present : None for the parties.

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

The matter is adjourned giving last and final opportunity to the parties to advance arguments on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **15.07.2026**.

Interim order dated 15.12.2023 is hereby vacated.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 675/23  
Khalid Ali Vs. MCD

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Junaid Alam, Ld. counsel for the appellant along  
with appellant.  
Sh. Paras Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments on the aspect of jurisdiction of this tribunal  
heard. Record perused.

The impugned sealing order as per the respondent  
was passed as per the directions of the Monitoring  
Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court  
of India and therefore, the jurisdiction lies with the  
Judicial Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme  
Court of India.

I have perused the impugned order. Same was  
passed by the MCD under Section 345-A of DMC Act  
and not on inspection carried out by the Monitoring  
Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court  
of India.

The office record shows that one complaint was  
received from one Shehzad Ali addressed to Lt.  
Governor of Delhi and that complaint was forwarded to  
the respondent for action. The Monitoring Committee  
did not play any role in sealing this property and  
therefore, this Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain this  
appeal.

...contd.2

Further arguments heard on appeal.

The appellant has placed on record the documents to show that the shop is in existence prior to 01.06.2014 and is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. The electricity bill filed along with appeal show the date of energization of non-domestic light in the subject property on 16.02.2012. The suit shop is in unauthorized colony and is being used for running a tailoring shop having an area of approximately of 14 sq. mtrs. This shop is protected being falling in the category of small shop and the activity of tailoring is permitted.

Even if, the property is being misused, the enforcement of the orders to seal the property are to be kept in abeyance as per the definition of unauthorized development provided under Section 2 (i) of National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

The sealing order dated 21.06.2023 is therefore, kept in respect of property of the appellant till this Act is in force. The respondent is at liberty to take action once the Act ceases to be in force. Appeal stands disposed of.

The property be desealed within 2 weeks from today.

...contd.3

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  
22.12.2025



A.No. 98/24

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Piyush Jain, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Ld. proxy counsel for the respondent.  
Sh. R.K. Mittal, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is busy in some other court.

An adjournment is also sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel is busy in Hon'ble High Court.

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 **16.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 1035/24

22.12.2025

Present : Ms. Ananya Singh, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant through VC.

Proxy counsel for the respondent.

It is submitted for the appellant that the name of the appellant is wrongly displayed in the cause list as 'Rinkky Gupta' instead of 'Rikky Gupta'. The Registry is directed to correct the name of the appellant in CIS server so that correct name is displayed in the cause list.

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 last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter.

Put up for arguments on **16.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 349/25

22.12.2025

Present :           None for the appellant.  
                  Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent.  
                  Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for arguments on **15.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 380/25

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Harish Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.  
Sh. P.K. Roy, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.  
Applicant/intervener Mohd. Jamil in person.

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

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as mother of the main counsel Sh. Ajay Gaur is hospitalized.

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 the application as well as appeal on **15.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 387/25

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Parmod Gupta, Ld. counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. P.K. Roy , Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant due to certain personal difficulty of the counsel for the appellant.

An adjournment is also sought on behalf of the respondent as mother of the main counsel Sh. Ajay Gaur is hospitalized.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **06.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 395/25

22.12.2025

Present : Proxy counsel for the appellant.  
None for the respondent.

Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant seeks pass over the matter.

Ld. counsel for the respondent is not available today.

Hence, the matter is adjourned.

Put up for arguments on **02.06.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 539/25 & 540/25

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Praveen Suri, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. Harshita Maheshwari, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel is held up before the Hon'ble High Court and will only be available in post-lunch sessions. Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that he has matter before the Hon'ble High Court and is not available in post-lunch sessions.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **12.01.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025

A.No. 809/25

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Manish Bhardwaj and Sh. Pradyot Pravash, Ld counsel for the appellant with appellant.

Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent joined through VC along with Sh. Shiv Chopra, proxy counsel and Sh. Sanjeev Kumar, AE(B) present in Court.

Ms. Rashi Bansal, Ld. counsel for respondent No.2 to 6.

Arguments heard.

Put up for orders on **23.12.2025**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.12.2025



A.No. 476/17 & 510/17

22.12.2025

Present : Ms. Meenakshi Kalra, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC along with Sh. Paras Kalra, Advocate present in the court.

Proxy Ld counsel for the respondent for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 476/17 and for Sh. H.R. Aggarwal in appeal no. 510/17.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present appeal are 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  
22.12.2025

A.No. 186/10 : Chennai Network Infra. Ltd. (transposed as M/s GTL Infrastructure Ltd.) Vs. MCD

A. No. 318/12 : Chennai Network Infrastructure Ltd. (transposed as M/s GTL Infrastructure Ltd.) Vs. MCD

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain and Sh. Gaurav Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 186/10.

Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 318/12.

Arguments heard at length.

1. The appellants in these appeals have challenged the rejection order dated 24.09.2009 whereby the application seeking permission of telecommunication tower at rooftop of property no. A-5A/217 and 218, Janakpuri, New Delhi was rejected as well as the demolition order dated 28.05.2012.
2. During the pendency of these appeals, the appellant was directed to file fresh application for regularization of telecommunication tower. The said application was filed on 15.11.2021. The appellant was directed to place on record the proof of payment of Rs. One lac as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in LPA no. 572/11, but till date no such proof was filed.
3. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the matter between the parties was settled before Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 572/11 vide order dated 28.08.2017. As per that settlement the appellants were required to file fresh applications which were to be decided as per law.

4. This arguments has been rebutted by the appellant by stating that no fresh application is required to be filed as the installation of telecommunication tower of the appellant is governed by the old order and circular passed in 2003 and 2008 whereas the settlement before Hon'ble High Court was in respect of new policy of respondent which has been stayed and therefore these appeals are to be decided on their own merits
5. I have perused the record of these cases as well as the order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.08.2017 passed in LPA No. 572/11 and the settlement agreement between the parties. As per this settlement agreement in para 6 (C) it is mentioned that, even the towers installed prior to new policy dated 08.04.2010 i.e. under the policy of 2003 by which the appellants are governed, are required to fulfill the terms of this settlement. Para 6 (C) of this settlement records that if the charges under previous policy of the year 2003 have been deposited no other fees shall be payable apart from Rs.1,00,000/- already deposited. Thereafter the telecommunication towers applicants were required to fulfill other requirement like submitting indemnity bond, NOC from CGHS, DDA, all owners of the building, copy of agreement from owners of roof rights etc. as applicable for particular location. The applicants are also required to submit building plan, location plan, relevant licenses etc. of which entire check list was provided in this settlement agreement. This settlement agreement was accepted by Hon'ble High Court and parties were bound by the terms of settlement. Aircel

Ltd., GTL Infrastructure Ltd. were the parties to this settlement who are appellants before me and therefore they are required to apply a fresh seeking installation of telecommunication towers subject of fulfillment of all the terms of the settlement including deposit of one time amount if not already deposited under old policy.

6. The appellants were therefore required to file fresh application for regularization of their telecommunication towers in terms of settlement agreement accepted in LPA No. 572/11, which they have already done and an order on that application shall give a fresh cause of action to the appellants in case the application is rejected.
7. As far as these appeals are concerned, the same are infructuous in view of the settlement arrived between the parties and accepted by the Hon'ble High Court which binds the parties. The appellant however, is required to show the proof of payment of Rs. One lac with the respondent as required under the old policy.
8. All the appeal are dismissed.
9. 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  
22.12.2025

A.No. 221/10

Chennai Network Infra. Ltd. (transposed as M/s GTL Infrastructure Ltd.) Vs. MCD

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain and Sh. Gaurav Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

1. The appellant in this appeal has challenged the rejection order dated 23.02.2010 whereby the application seeking permission of telecommunication tower at rooftop of property/House no. 36, North Avenue Road, Punjabi Bagh, New Delhi was rejected.
2. During the pendency of this appeal, the appellant was directed to file fresh application for regularization of telecommunication tower. The said application was filed on 15.03.2022. The appellant was directed to place on record the proof of payment of Rs. One lac as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in LPA no. 572/11, but till date no such proof was filed.
3. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the matter between the parties was settled before Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 572/11 vide order dated 28.08.2017. As per that settlement the appellants were required to file fresh applications which were to be decided as per law.
4. This arguments has been rebutted by the appellant by stating that no fresh application is required to be filed as the installation of telecommunication tower of the appellant is governed by the old order and circular passed in 2003 and 2008 whereas the settlement before Hon'ble High Court was

in respect of new policy of respondent which has been stayed and therefore these appeals are to be decided on their own merits.

5. I have perused the record of these cases as well as the order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.08.2017 passed in LPA No. 572/11 and the settlement agreement between the parties. As per this settlement agreement in para 6 (C) it is mentioned that, even the towers installed prior to new policy dated 08.04.2010 i.e. under the policy of 2003 by which the appellants are governed, are required to fulfill the terms of this settlement. Para 6 (C) of this settlement records that if the charges under previous policy of the year 2003 have been deposited no other fees shall be payable apart from Rs.1,00,000/- already deposited. Thereafter the telecommunication towers applicants were required to fulfill other requirement like submitting indemnity bond, NOC from CGHS, DDA, all owners of the building, copy of agreement from owners of roof rights etc. as applicable for particular location. The applicants are also required to submit building plan, location plan, relevant licenses etc. of which entire check list was provided in this settlement agreement. This settlement agreement was accepted by Hon'ble High Court and parties were bound by the terms of settlement. Aircel Ltd., GTL Infrastructure Ltd. were the parties to this settlement who are appellants before me and therefore they are required to apply a fresh seeking installation of telecommunication towers subject of fulfillment of all the

terms of the settlement including deposit of one time amount if not already deposited under old policy.

6. The appellant was therefore required to file fresh application for regularization of their telecommunication towers in terms of settlement agreement accepted in LPA No. 572/11, which appellant has already done and an order on that application shall give a fresh cause of action to the appellant in case the application is rejected.
7. As far as this appeal is concerned, the same is infructuous in view of the settlement arrived between the parties and accepted by the Hon'ble High Court which binds the parties. The appellant however, is required to show the proof of payment of Rs. One lac with the respondent as required under the old policy.
8. The aforesaid appeal is dismissed.
9. 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  
22.12.2025

A.No. 398/10 : Chennai Network Infra. Ltd. (transposed as M/s  
GTL

Infrastructure Ltd.) Vs. MCD

A. No. 163/14 : Chennai Network Infrastructure Ltd. (transposed  
as M/s GTL

Infrastructure Ltd.)Vs. MCD

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain and Sh. Gaurav Jain, Ld counsel for the  
appellant.

None for the respondent in the aforesaid appeals.

Arguments heard at length.

1. The appellants in these appeals have challenged the rejection order dated 11.05.2010 whereby the application seeking permission of telecommunication tower at rooftop of property bearing Khasra no. 37/8, Village Burari, Kaushik Enclvae, Gali no. 16, Block-5, Nathupura Road, Delhi was rejected as well as the sealing of the telecommunication tower.
2. During the pendency of these appeals, the appellant was directed to file fresh application for regularization of telecommunication tower. No such application was filed. The appellant was directed to place on record the proof of payment of Rs. One lac as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in LPA no. 572/11, but till date no such proof was filed.
3. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the matter between the parties was settled before Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 572/11 vide order dated 28.08.2017. As per that settlement the appellants were required to file fresh applications which were to be decided as per law.



4. This arguments has been rebutted by the appellant by stating that no fresh application is required to be filed as the installation of telecommunication tower of the appellant is governed by the old order and circular passed in 2003 and 2008 whereas the settlement before Hon'ble High Court was in respect of new policy of respondent which has been stayed and therefore these appeals are to be decided on their own merits
5. I have perused the record of these cases as well as the order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.08.2017 passed in LPA No. 572/11 and the settlement agreement between the parties. As per this settlement agreement in para 6 (C) it is mentioned that, even the towers installed prior to new policy dated 08.04.2010 i.e. under the policy of 2003 by which the appellants are governed, are required to fulfill the terms of this settlement. Para 6 (C) of this settlement records that if the charges under previous policy of the year 2003 have been deposited no other fees shall be payable apart from Rs.1,00,000/- already deposited. Thereafter the telecommunication towers applicants were required to fulfill other requirement like submitting indemnity bond, NOC from CGHS, DDA, all owners of the building, copy of agreement from owners of roof rights etc. as applicable for particular location. The applicants are also required to submit building plan, location plan, relevant licenses etc. of which entire check list was provided in this settlement agreement. This settlement agreement was accepted by Hon'ble High Court and parties were bound by the terms of settlement. Aircel

Ltd., GTL Infrastructure Ltd. were the parties to this settlement who are appellants before me and therefore they are required to apply a fresh seeking installation of telecommunication towers subject of fulfillment of all the terms of the settlement including deposit of one time amount if not already deposited under old policy.

6. The appellants are therefore required to file fresh application for regularization of their telecommunication towers in terms of settlement agreement accepted in LPA No. 572/11, which they have not done and an order on that application shall give a fresh cause of action to the appellants in case the application is rejected.
7. As far as these appeals are concerned, the same are infructuous in view of the settlement arrived between the parties and accepted by the Hon'ble High Court which binds the parties. The appellant however, is required to show the proof of payment of Rs. One lac with the respondent as required under the old policy.
8. All the appeal are dismissed.
9. 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  
22.12.2025

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain and Sh. Gaurav Jain, Ld counsel for the  
appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

1. The appellants in these appeals have challenged the rejection order dated 08.01.2014 whereby the application seeking permission of telecommunication tower at rooftop of property no. 203A, Gali no. 18, Block K-I, Sangam Vihar, Delhi was rejected as well as the demolition order dated 27.08.2013 and sealing of the property.
2. During the pendency of these appeals, the appellant was directed to file fresh application for regularization of telecommunication tower. The said application was filed on 01.02.2023. The appellant was directed to place on record the proof of payment of Rs. One lac as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in LPA no. 572/11, but till date no such proof was filed.
3. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the matter between the parties was settled before Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 572/11 vide order dated 28.08.2017. As per that settlement the appellants were required to file fresh applications which were to be decided as per law.
4. This arguments has been rebutted by the appellant by stating that no fresh application is required to be filed as the installation of telecommunication tower of the appellant is

governed by the old order and circular passed in 2003 and 2008 whereas the settlement before Hon'ble High Court was in respect of new policy of respondent which has been stayed and therefore these appeals are to be decided on their own merits

5. I have perused the record of these cases as well as the order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.08.2017 passed in LPA No. 572/11 and the settlement agreement between the parties. As per this settlement agreement in para 6 (C) it is mentioned that, even the towers installed prior to new policy dated 08.04.2010 i.e. under the policy of 2003 by which the appellants are governed, are required to fulfill the terms of this settlement. Para 6 (C) of this settlement records that if the charges under previous policy of the year 2003 have been deposited no other fees shall be payable apart from Rs.1,00,000/- already deposited. Thereafter the telecommunication towers applicants were required to fulfill other requirement like submitting indemnity bond, NOC from CGHS, DDA, all owners of the building, copy of agreement from owners of roof rights etc. as applicable for particular location. The applicants are also required to submit building plan, location plan, relevant licenses etc. of which entire check list was provided in this settlement agreement. This settlement agreement was accepted by Hon'ble High Court and parties were bound by the terms of settlement. Aircel Ltd., GTL Infrastructure Ltd. were the parties to this settlement who are appellants before me and therefore they are required to apply a fresh seeking installation of

telecommunication towers subject of fulfillment of all the terms of the settlement including deposit of one time amount if not already deposited under old policy.

6. The appellants are therefore required to file fresh application for regularization of their telecommunication towers in terms of settlement agreement accepted in LPA No. 572/11, which they have already done and an order on that application shall give a fresh cause of action to the appellants in case the application is rejected.
7. As far as these appeals are concerned, the same are infructuous in view of the settlement arrived between the parties and accepted by the Hon'ble High Court which binds the parties. The appellants however, are required to show the proof of payment of Rs. One lac with the respondent as required under the old policy.
8. All the appeal are dismissed.
9. 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  
22.12.2025

A.No. 1202/13

Chennai Network Infrastructure Ltd. (transposed as M/s GTL Infrastructure Ltd.) Vs. MCD

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain and Sh. Gaurav Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

1. The appellant in this appeal has challenged the sealing order dated 02.08.2013 whereby the telecommunication tower installed at rooftop of property no. E-474, Gali no. 7A, Sangam Vihar, New Delhi was sealed.
2. During the pendency of this appeal, the appellant was directed to file fresh application for regularization of telecommunication tower in view of the settlement between the parties in LPA no. 572/11. The said application was filed on 01.02.2023. The appellant was directed to place on record the proof of payment of Rs. One lac as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in LPA no. 572/11, but till date no such proof was filed.
3. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the matter between the parties was settled before Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 572/11 vide order dated 28.08.2017. As per that settlement the appellant was required to file fresh applications which were to be decided as per law.
4. This arguments has been rebutted by the appellant by stating that no fresh application is required to be filed as the installation of telecommunication tower of the appellant is governed by the old order and circular passed in 2003 and

2008 whereas the settlement before Hon'ble High Court was in respect of new policy of respondent which has been stayed and therefore these appeals are to be decided on their own merits

5. I have perused the record of these cases as well as the order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.08.2017 passed in LPA No. 572/11 and the settlement agreement between the parties. As per this settlement agreement in para 6 (C) it is mentioned that, even the towers installed prior to new policy dated 08.04.2010 i.e. under the policy of 2003 by which the appellants are governed, are required to fulfill the terms of this settlement. Para 6 (C) of this settlement records that if the charges under previous policy of the year 2003 have been deposited no other fees shall be payable apart from Rs.1,00,000/- already deposited. Thereafter the telecommunication towers applicants were required to fulfill other requirement like submitting indemnity bond, NOC from CGHS, DDA, all owners of the building, copy of agreement from owners of roof rights etc. as applicable for particular location. The applicants are also required to submit building plan, location plan, relevant licenses etc. of which entire check list was provided in this settlement agreement. This settlement agreement was accepted by Hon'ble High Court and parties were bound by the terms of settlement. Aircel Ltd., GTL Infrastructure Ltd. were the parties to this settlement who are appellants before me and therefore they are required to apply a fresh seeking installation of

telecommunication towers subject of fulfillment of all the terms of the settlement including deposit of one time amount if not already deposited under old policy.

6. The appellant has already filed fresh application for regularization of their telecommunication towers in terms of settlement agreement accepted in LPA No. 572/11 and an order on that application shall give a fresh cause of action to the appellants in case the application is rejected.
7. As far as this appeal is concerned, the same is infructuous in view of the settlement arrived between the parties and accepted by the Hon'ble High Court which binds the parties. The appellant however, is required to show the proof of payment of Rs. One lac with the respondent as required under the old policy.
8. The appeal is dismissed.
9. 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  
22.12.2025



A.No. 1203/13

Chennai Network Infrastructure Ltd. (transposed as M/s GTL Infrastructure Ltd.) Vs. MCD

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain and Sh. Gaurav Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

1. The appellant in this appeal has challenged the sealing order dated 25.10.2013 whereby the telecommunication tower installed at rooftop of property no. 17/2979/1, Ranjit Nagar, New Delhi was sealed.
2. During the pendency of this appeal, the appellant was directed to file fresh application for regularization of telecommunication tower in view of the settlement between the parties in LPA no. 572/11. The said application was filed on 01.02.2023. The appellant was directed to place on record the proof of payment of Rs. One lac as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in LPA no. 572/11, but till date no such proof was filed. That application has already been rejected on 01.08.2023.
3. It has been argued by the appellant that no fresh application is required to be filed as the installation of telecommunication tower of the appellant is governed by the old order and circular passed in 2003 and 2008 whereas the settlement before Hon'ble High Court was in respect of new policy of respondent which has been stayed and therefore these appeals are to be decided on their own merits.

4. I have perused the record of these cases as well as the order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.08.2017 passed in LPA No. 572/11 and the settlement agreement between the parties. As per this settlement agreement in para 6 (C) it is mentioned that, even the towers installed prior to new policy dated 08.04.2010 i.e. under the policy of 2003 by which the appellants are governed, are required to fulfill the terms of this settlement. Para 6 (C) of this settlement records that if the charges under previous policy of the year 2003 have been deposited no other fees shall be payable apart from Rs.1,00,000/- already deposited. Thereafter the telecommunication towers applicants were required to fulfill other requirement like submitting indemnity bond, NOC from CGHS, DDA, all owners of the building, copy of agreement from owners of roof rights etc. as applicable for particular location. The applicants are also required to submit building plan, location plan, relevant licenses etc. of which entire check list was provided in this settlement agreement. This settlement agreement was accepted by Hon'ble High Court and parties were bound by the terms of settlement. Aircel Ltd., GTL Infrastructure Ltd. were the parties to this settlement who are appellants before me and therefore they are required to apply a fresh seeking installation of telecommunication towers subject of fulfillment of all the terms of the settlement including deposit of one time amount if not already deposited under old policy.

5. The appellant has already filed fresh application for regularization of their telecommunication towers in terms of settlement agreement accepted in LPA No. 572/11 and that has already been rejected and has given a fresh cause of action to the appellant.
6. As far as this appeal is concerned, the same is infructuous in view of the settlement arrived between the parties and accepted by the Hon'ble High Court which binds the parties. The appellant also failed to show the proof of payment of Rs. One lac with the respondent as required under the old policy.
7. The appeal is dismissed.
8. 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  
22.12.2025

A.No. 9/14 & 53/14

Chennai Network Infrastructure Ltd. (transposed as M/s GTL Infrastructure Ltd.)Vs. MCD

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain and Gaurav Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

1. The appellants in these appeals have challenged the rejection order whereby the application seeking permission of telecommunication tower at rooftop of property no. 501 and 502, Jahangir Puri was rejected as well as the sealing order dated 09.12.2013 vide which the telecommunication tower was sealed.
2. During the pendency of these appeals, the appellant was directed to file fresh application for regularization of telecommunication tower. The said application was filed on 15.03.2022 and was again rejected on 16.11.2022. The appellant was again directed to re-apply for regularization vide order dated 13.12.2022, but no such application has been filed as per status report dated 20.03.2023.
3. These orders have been challenged on the ground that the installation of telecommunication tower is governed by the office order dated 20.11.2003 and circular dated 07.02.2008. The appellants fulfilled all the requirements of these order and circular yet their applications were rejected without any justification and the penal powers were exercised in violation of these two orders and circular and therefore the rejection orders and sealing orders should be declared null and void.

4. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the matter between the parties was settled before Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 572/11 vide order dated 28.08.2017. As per that settlement the appellants were required to file fresh applications which were to be decided as per law.
5. This arguments has been rebutted by the appellant by stating that no fresh application is required to be filed as the installation of telecommunication tower of the appellant is governed by the old order and circular passed in 2003 and 2008 whereas the settlement before Hon'ble High Court was in respect of new policy of respondent which has been stayed and therefore these appeals are to be decided on their own merits
6. I have perused the record of these cases as well as the order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.08.2017 passed in LPA No. 572/11 and the settlement agreement between the parties. As per this settlement agreement in para 6 (C) it is mentioned that, even the towers installed prior to new policy dated 08.04.2010 i.e. under the policy of 2003 by which the appellants are governed, are required to fulfill the terms of this settlement. Para 6 (C) of this settlement records that if the charges under previous policy of the year 2003 have been deposited no other fees shall be payable apart from Rs.1,00,000/- already deposited. Thereafter the telecommunication towers applicants were required to fulfill other requirement like submitting indemnity bond, NOC from CGHS, DDA, all owners of the building, copy of agreement from owners of roof rights etc. as applicable for particular

location. The applicants are also required to submit building plan, location plan, relevant licenses etc. of which entire check list was provided in this settlement agreement. This settlement agreement was accepted by Hon'ble High Court and parties were bound by the terms of settlement. Aircel Ltd., GTL Infrastructure Ltd. were the parties to this settlement who are appellants before me and therefore they are required to apply a fresh seeking installation of telecommunication towers subject of fulfillment of all the terms of the settlement including deposit of one time amount if not already deposited under old policy.

7. The appellants are therefore required to file fresh application for regularization of their telecommunication towers in terms of settlement agreement accepted in LPA No. 572/11 and an order on that application shall give a fresh cause of action to the appellants in case the application is rejected.
8. As far as these appeals are concerned, the same are infructuous in view of the settlement arrived between the parties and accepted by the Hon'ble High Court which binds the parties.
9. All the appeals are dismissed.
10. 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  
22.12.2025

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain and Gaurav Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

1. The appellants in these appeals have challenged the rejection order dated 08.01.2024 whereby the application seeking permission of telecommunication tower at rooftop of property no. 1-5/297A, Sangam Vihar, New Delhi was rejected as well as the sealing order dated 25.09.2013 vide which the telecommunication tower was sealed and demolition order dated 27.08.2023 was passed. During the pendency of these appeals, the appellant was directed to file fresh application for regularization of telecommunication tower. The said application was filed on 25.11.2019. The appellant was directed to place on record the proof of payment of Rs. One lac as directed by the Hon'ble High Court in LPA no. 572/11, but till date no such proof was filed.
2. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the matter between the parties was settled before Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 572/11 vide order dated 28.08.2017. As per that settlement the appellants were required to file fresh applications which were to be decided as per law.
3. This arguments has been rebutted by the appellant by stating that no fresh application is required to be filed as the installation of telecommunication tower of the appellant is

governed by the old order and circular passed in 2003 and 2008 whereas the settlement before Hon'ble High Court was in respect of new policy of respondent which has been stayed and therefore these appeals are to be decided on their own merits

4. I have perused the record of these cases as well as the order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.08.2017 passed in LPA No. 572/11 and the settlement agreement between the parties. As per this settlement agreement in para 6 (C) it is mentioned that, even the towers installed prior to new policy dated 08.04.2010 i.e. under the policy of 2003 by which the appellants are governed, are required to fulfill the terms of this settlement. Para 6 (C) of this settlement records that if the charges under previous policy of the year 2003 have been deposited no other fees shall be payable apart from Rs.1,00,000/- already deposited. Thereafter the telecommunication towers applicants were required to fulfill other requirement like submitting indemnity bond, NOC from CGHS, DDA, all owners of the building, copy of agreement from owners of roof rights etc. as applicable for particular location. The applicants are also required to submit building plan, location plan, relevant licenses etc. of which entire check list was provided in this settlement agreement. This settlement agreement was accepted by Hon'ble High Court and parties were bound by the terms of settlement. Aircel Ltd., GTL Infrastructure Ltd. were the parties to this settlement who are appellants before me and therefore they



are required to apply a fresh seeking installation of telecommunication towers subject of fulfillment of all the terms of the settlement including deposit of one time amount if not already deposited under old policy.

5. The appellants are therefore required to file fresh application for regularization of their telecommunication towers in terms of settlement agreement accepted in LPA No. 572/11, which they have already done and an order on that application shall give a fresh cause of action to the appellants in case the application is rejected.
6. As far as these appeals are concerned, the same are infructuous in view of the settlement arrived between the parties and accepted by the Hon'ble High Court which binds the parties. The appellant however, is required to show the proof of payment of Rs. One lac with the respondent as required under the old policy.
7. All the appeal are dismissed.
8. 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  
22.12.2025

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain and Sh. Gaurav Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

1. The appellant in this appeal has challenged the sealing order dated 19.02.2024 whereby the telecommunication tower installed at rooftop of property Khasra no. 319/1 and 310/1, Village Aali, Mehrauli, New Delhi was sealed.
2. During the pendency of this appeal, the appellant was directed to file fresh application for regularization of telecommunication tower in view of the settlement between the parties in LPA no. 572/11. The said application was filed on 15.03.2022. It was thereafter stated for the respondent that appellant is required to apply online and no offline application is accepted. The appellant thereafter, did not apply online for regularization of the tower. Though, the proof of preparing the demand draft in favour of the respondent was placed on record, but the G-8 receipt showing the proof of payment made with the respondent, was not filed.
3. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the matter between the parties was settled before Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 572/11 vide order dated 28.08.2017. As per that settlement the appellant was required to file fresh applications which were to be decided as per law.

4. This arguments has been rebutted by the appellant by stating that no fresh application is required to be filed as the installation of telecommunication tower of the appellant is governed by the old order and circular passed in 2003 and 2008 whereas the settlement before Hon'ble High Court was in respect of new policy of respondent which has been stayed and therefore these appeals are to be decided on their own merits
5. I have perused the record of these cases as well as the order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.08.2017 passed in LPA No. 572/11 and the settlement agreement between the parties. As per this settlement agreement in para 6 (C) it is mentioned that, even the towers installed prior to new policy dated 08.04.2010 i.e. under the policy of 2003 by which the appellants are governed, are required to fulfill the terms of this settlement. Para 6 (C) of this settlement records that if the charges under previous policy of the year 2003 have been deposited no other fees shall be payable apart from Rs.1,00,000/- already deposited. Thereafter the telecommunication towers applicants were required to fulfill other requirement like submitting indemnity bond, NOC from CGHS, DDA, all owners of the building, copy of agreement from owners of roof rights etc. as applicable for particular location. The applicants are also required to submit building plan, location plan, relevant licenses etc. of which entire check list was provided in this settlement agreement. This settlement agreement was accepted by Hon'ble High Court

and parties were bound by the terms of settlement. Aircel Ltd., GTL Infrastructure Ltd. were the parties to this settlement who are appellants before me and therefore they are required to apply a fresh seeking installation of telecommunication towers subject of fulfillment of all the terms of the settlement including deposit of one time amount if not already deposited under old policy.

6. The appellant has already filed fresh application for regularization of their telecommunication towers in terms of settlement agreement accepted in LPA No. 572/11 and an order on that application shall give a fresh cause of action to the appellants in case the application is rejected.
7. As far as this appeal is concerned, the same is infructuous in view of the settlement arrived between the parties and accepted by the Hon'ble High Court which binds the parties. The appellant however, is required to show the proof of payment of Rs. One lac with the respondent as required under the old policy.
8. The appeal is dismissed.
9. 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  
22.12.2025

A.No. 683/15

GTL Infrastructure Ltd. vs. MCD

22.12.2025

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain and Sh. Gaurav Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. H.R. Agarwal, Advocate for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

1. The appellant in this appeal has challenged the sealing order dated 18.08.2015 whereby the telecommunication tower installed at rooftop of property no. G-135, New Seelampur, Shahdara, Delhi was sealed.
2. During the pendency of this appeal, the appellant was directed to file fresh application for regularization of telecommunication tower in view of the settlement between the parties in LPA no. 572/11. The said application was filed on 15.11.2021 and same was rejected on 12.05.2022. It was again reopened on the order of this court dated 16.08.2022 and thereafter, the same was dismissed as recorded in the order dated 22.03.2023.
3. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the matter between the parties was settled before Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 572/11 vide order dated 28.08.2017. As per that settlement the appellant was required to file fresh applications which were to be decided as per law.

4. This arguments has been rebutted by the appellant by stating that no fresh application is required to be filed as the installation of telecommunication tower of the appellant is governed by the old order and circular passed in 2003 and 2008 whereas the settlement before Hon'ble High Court was in respect of new policy of respondent which has been stayed and therefore these appeals are to be decided on their own merits
5. I have perused the record of these cases as well as the order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.08.2017 passed in LPA No. 572/11 and the settlement agreement between the parties. As per this settlement agreement in para 6 (C) it is mentioned that, even the towers installed prior to new policy dated 08.04.2010 i.e. under the policy of 2003 by which the appellants are governed, are required to fulfill the terms of this settlement. Para 6 (C) of this settlement records that if the charges under previous policy of the year 2003 have been deposited no other fees shall be payable apart from Rs.1,00,000/- already deposited. Thereafter the telecommunication towers applicants were required to fulfill other requirement like submitting indemnity bond, NOC from CGHS, DDA, all owners of the building, copy of agreement from owners of roof rights etc. as applicable for particular location. The applicants are also required to submit building plan, location plan, relevant licenses etc. of which entire check list was provided in this settlement agreement. This settlement agreement was accepted by Hon'ble High Court and parties were bound by the terms of settlement. Aircel

Ltd., GTL Infrastructure Ltd. were the parties to this settlement who are appellants before me and therefore they are required to apply a fresh seeking installation of telecommunication towers subject of fulfillment of all the terms of the settlement including deposit of one time amount if not already deposited under old policy.

6. The appellant has already filed fresh application for regularization of their telecommunication towers in terms of settlement agreement accepted in LPA No. 572/11 and same has already been rejected giving a fresh cause of action to the appellants.
7. As far as this appeal is concerned, the same is infructuous in view of the settlement arrived between the parties and accepted by the Hon'ble High Court which binds the parties.
8. The fresh rejection is a fresh cause of action which is required to be challenged separately.
9. The appeal is dismissed.
10. 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  
22.12.2025