

A.No. 880/25

06.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Ayush Dassi and Sh. Deepesh Kasana, Ld counsels 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 **26.05.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant bearing no. E-9/2, Abul Fazal Enclave, Part-I, Jamia Nagar, Okhla, Delhi, in pursuance of the demolition order dated 07.04.2025. 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
06.01.2026

A.No. 883/25
Subash Chauhan and Ors. Vs. MCD

06.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Sonia Mendiratta, Sh. Amit Gupta and Sh. Ashmeet Singh, Ld counsels for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The impugned demolition order dated 12.12.2025 records that personal hearing in the matter was fixed for 17.10.2025, but on 16.10.2025, the appellants requested a short adjournment which was not granted by the Quasi Judicial Authority and the reasons for not granting this opportunity are not mentioned in the impugned order. The opportunity of personal hearing is not a mere formality and the Quasi Judicial Authority should have considered the request of change of date of personal hearing made by the appellants prior to the date of hearing. In these facts, the impugned demolition order is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after giving personal hearing to the appellant.

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 20.01.2026 at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

....contd.2

: 2 :

The appeal is allowed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 1/26

06.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellants.

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 **19.05.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant except first and fourth floor in pursuance of the demolition order dated 10.12.2025. 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
06.01.2026

A.No. 2/26
Annie Koshi Vs. MCD

06.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Ravi Kapoor, Sh. Rishav Ambastha and Sh. Pranay Aggarwal, Ld counsels for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The impugned demolition order dated 05.12.2025 has been challenged on several grounds including that show cause notice was never served upon the appellant. The demolition order records that the show cause notice dated 17.09.2025 was not replied by the appellants and therefore, the demolition order was passed.

The opportunity of personal hearing is not a mere formality. In view of the same, the matter is remanded back with directions to the respondent to give opportunity to the appellant to file reply to this demolition order which shall be considered as show cause notice and also to file the documents, if desired and also to give personal hearing to the appellant and thereafter, to pass a speaking order after considering the reply/documents submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant.

...contd.2

: 2 :

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 27.01.2026 at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

The appeal stands allowed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 151/17 & 237/17

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Abhishek Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

It is already 1.20 pm.

Ld. counsel for the respondent is not available after lunch.

At request, put up for arguments on **20.02.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 416/18 & 417/18

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. M.N. Siddiqui, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

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

Arguments on behalf of the appellant heard.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the respondent on the ground that he is out of town and could not be able to return due to heavy fog.

The appeals pertain to the year 2018.

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

Put up for further arguments on **28.01.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 315/19, 685/22, 704/22 & 52/23

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Shankar, husband of the appellant in person.
Sh. Jatin Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 315/19 through VC.
Sh. Sachin Singh Sahi, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 52/23 through VC.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 685/22 & 704/22.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as his counsel is not available today due to bad health.

The appeal pertains to the years 2019, 2022 & 2023. However, 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 **19.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 566/19

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Subhan Shankar Gogoi, Ms. Narayani Sepaha and
Sh. Shaantanu Jain, Ld. counsel for the appellant through
VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent/MCD.
Sh. Sidharath Dua, Ld.counsel for the respondent no. 2.

Challenge to the sanctioned building plan before this Tribunal by the appellant is on the ground of concealment of the facts that the appellant is a co-owner of the property whereas the challenge before the Hon'ble High Court in the writ petition is on the ground of grant of sanction plan in violation of Master Plan of Delhi.

Both the issues are separate and therefore, pendency of writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court cannot be a reason to adjourn this matter.

At request, put up for arguments on appeal 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
06.01.2026

A.No. 607/19

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Subham Jha, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is out of town.

The appeal pertains to the year 2019.

However, 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 **10.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 14/20

06.01.2026

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

It is submitted that matter between the appellant and the private respondents is pending before the Mediation Center and is now fixed for 30.01.2026 and outcome of that mediation shall have bearing on this appeal challenging the sanction accorded to the private respondent.

At request, put up for further proceedings awaiting outcome of that mediation proceedings on **27.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 331/21

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Achin Mittal and Sh. Mohak Sharma, Ld. counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks some short adjournment on some personal grounds.

At request, put up for arguments on **11.02.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 215/22 & 216/22

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Mridul Vats, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Beena Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 751/22 & 152/24

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Rajeshwar K. Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Raja K. Ojha, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent in 152/24.
None for the respondent in appeal no. 751/22.

Arguments heard on the application seeking condonation of delay in appeal no. 152/24.

The rejection of regularization application was done vide order dated 15.01.2024 which was sent through speed post on 27.01.2024 and was received on 01.02.2024. This appeal was filed on 01.03.2024. With an endeavour to decide the appeal on merit, the delay is condoned.

The application stands disposed of.

At request, put up for arguments on both the appeals 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
06.01.2026

A.No. 56/23

06.01.2026

Present : Ms. Vatsala Chauhan, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

It is stated by the Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant that documents were submitted within 15 days as mentioned in the status report dated 15.04.2025.

Ld. counsel for the respondent on the other hand states that the regularization application of the appellant has been rejected.

On request, put up for arguments on the appeal on **26.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 218/23 & 219/23

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Shubham Sharma, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel the respondent.

It is already 1.20 pm.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel is un-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. At request, put up for arguments on **20.02.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 64/24 & 65/24

06.01.2026

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant through
VC.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld. counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

Vide separate common 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
06.01.2026

A.No. 133/24 & 176/24 & 253/24

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. G.R. Verma and Sh. H.K. Sharma Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, proxy counsel for Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent in appeal no. 133/24.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 176/24 & 253/24

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **28.01.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 254/24

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. G.R. Verma and Sh. H.K. Sharma Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks time to clarify regarding service of show cause notice dated 21.02.2024.

At request, put up for further arguments on **03.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 158/24

06.01.2026

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

Sh. Shubham Sharma, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 158/24.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks adjournment for advancing arguments on the ground that file has been misplaced.

At request, put up for arguments on **08.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 239/24 & 240/24

06.01.2026

Present : Ms. Aditi Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant through
VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **29.01.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 241/24 & 242/24

06.01.2026

Present : Ms. Aditi Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant through
VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **30.01.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 243/24 & 244/24

06.01.2026

Present : Ms. Aditi Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant through
VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **30.01.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 909/24, 910/24, 911/24 & 912/24

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Chander M. Maini, Ld counsel for the appellant in appeal Nos. 909/24, 910/24, 911/24 & 912/24.

Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal No.904/24 joined through VC.

Sh. Apoorv Sisodia, Ld. counsel for respondent in appeal Nos.910/24 & 911/24.

Ms. Jasleen Kaur, Ld. counsel for respondent in appeal Nos.909/24 & 912/24 joined through VC.

Part arguments heard on the application filed by the appellant under Order VI Rule 17 CPC.

By way of this application the appellant wants to challenge the two demolition order dated 27.09.2007 and 11.01.2008.

In the original appeal the sealing order has been challenged.

Ld. counsel for appellant during arguments submitted that the appellant intends to challenge sealing as well as demolition order in these appeals.

Both the orders cannot be challenged in one appeal and separate appeal is required to be filed for challenging the demolition order and the sealing order.

....contd.2

: 2 :

Ld. counsel for appellant seeks time to satisfy that common appeal is maintainable in this regard.

The record attached with appeal no. 889/24 is detached and be attached with the file of appeal no. 909/24.

At request, put up for arguments on the aforesaid application as well as appeal on **17.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 904/24

Sh. Madan Mohan Sharma Vs. MCD

06.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.

Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent joined 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/06.01.26

At 2.40 pm

Present :

None for the appellant.

Sh. Atul Tanwar, 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 previous date of hearing i.e. 20.09.2025 as well.

It is 2.40 PM. It appears that appellant is not interested in prosecuting this appeal. The present appeal is dismissed in default.

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
06.01.2026

A.No. 888/24 & 889/24

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Atul Kumar Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar , Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for appellant submits that he has instructions to withdraw the present appeal.

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

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

Copy of this order be sent to the AE (B) concerned for information.

Record attached with appeal No.889/24 be detached and tagged with appeal Nos.909/24.

Appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 906/24

06.01.2026

Present : Appellant in person through VC.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

The appellant has challenged the vacation notice dated 26.09.2024 in this appeal. The vacation notice cannot be challenged and appeal is not maintainable.

Appellant seeks some time to make submission on this aspect.

Put up for arguments on **17.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 915/24

06.01.2026

Present : Ms. Aditi Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Appellant No.2 has already filed his affidavit in support of the appeal.

The predecessor-in-interest of the property Sh. T.S. Rajgopalan passed away even before filing this appeal. Any person aggrieved can challenge the demolition order and there is no requirement to have details of all the LRs of T.S. Rajgopalan.

At request put up for arguments on **10.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 107/25

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. S.K. Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Vasu Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent through
VC.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The demolition order dated 10.02.2025 is under challenge on several grounds including non-consideration of reply of the appellant.

Record shows that the show cause notice dated 22.01.2025 was dispatched through speed post on 25.01.2025 and was delivered to the appellant on 27.01.2025 and reply was filed.

Ld. counsel for the respondent however submits that as per the status report dated 21.03.2025, the demolition order was passed on 28.02.2025 and seeks time to clarify.

At request, put up for further arguments/clarifications on
30.01.2026.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 185/25 : Digvijay Pal and Anr. vs. MCD
A. No.186/25 : Digvijay Pal and Anr. vs. MCD
A. No. 187/25 : Digvijay Pal and Anr. vs. MCD

06.01.2026

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

Arguments heard at length.

1. The appellant in these three appeals has challenged the two demolition orders dated 01.10.2024 and 29.05.2024 passed in respect of the ground, first and second floor of the property bearing no. 508, Katra Asharfi, Chandni Chowk, Delhi and the sealing order dated 06.11.2024 in appeal no. 186/25.
2. The grounds of appeal in appeal no. 186/25 and 187/25 are that the replies of the appellant to the show cause notices were not considered and the orders were passed by simply stating that the reply is not satisfactory.
3. In appeal no. 185/25, it was stated that the show cause notice was never served upon the appellant as the same was sent through post in the name of owner/builder and there is no tracking report as to whom it was delivered. Reliance was placed on the judgment of '*Jaspal Singh Jolly Vs. Municipal Corp. Of Delhi, (2005) 125 DLT 592*'.

...contd.2

: 2 :

4. Ld. counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that though it is mentioned in the orders that the reply was not satisfactory, but the reply was considered and since, it was not satisfactory, the demolition orders and the sealing orders were passed in appeal no. 186/25 and 187/25.
5. For appeal no. 185/25, it was argued that notice was sent at the correct address through post and was not received back undelivered and there is presumption of service of show cause notice.
6. Record shows that the appellant gave replies in time to the show cause notices in the two appeals no. 186/25 and 187/25, but the impugned orders say that the reply was not satisfactory.
7. Further, in appeal no. 187/25, the copy filed by the appellant of the impugned order dated 29.05.2024 does not mention the words 'no satisfactory reply', but in the office file, these words have been recorded in the said order. It appears that reply of the appellant was not considered at the time of passing this order, but later on, the reply was read and found to be not satisfactory.

....contd.3

: 3 :

8. In any case, the impugned order mentioning that the reply is not satisfactory is non-speaking order and is required to be set aside, for which reliance can be placed on the judgment 13.03.2024 of Hon'ble Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court passed in W.P.(C) 3636/24 tilted as '**Real Steel Tyre Company Vs The Principal Commissioner of GST**' wherein in para 5, it has been observed that the order saying reply was unsatisfactory ex-facie shows that there was no application of mind to the reply of the petitioner and without considering the reply of the concerned person. In view of this law even the sealing order is not sustainable.
9. In these facts, the impugned sealing order dated 06.11.2024 in appeal no. 186/25 and the demolition orders dated 29.05.2024 in appeal no. 187/25 are set aside and the matter is remanded back.
10. Coming to appeal no. 185/25, a show cause notice was sent through speed post in the name of owner/builder and there is no tracking report. The show cause notice in appeal no. 186/25 was sent in the name of Sh. Deshbandhu, but why the notice in

...contd.4

: 4 :

appeal no. 185/25 was not sent in his name is not clear. There is no track consignment report and the record shows that the demolition order was also sent in the name of owner/builder and the envelop returned back unserved with the report 'no such person' at this address. When, the name of the addressee was mentioned as owner/builder, there is no presumption that same was duly served as argued for the respondent. Therefore, the appeal no. 185/25 is also allowed and the matter is remanded back.

11. All the three appeals are allowed and the demolition orders dated 29.05.2024, 01.10.2024 and sealing order dated 06.11.2024 passed in respect of the property bearing no. 508, Katra Asharfi, Chandni Chowk, Delhi, are set aside.
12. The respondent shall give an opportunity to the appellant to file documents as well as personal hearing and thereafter, shall pass an speaking order within 6 weeks of conclusion of hearing. The impugned orders be considered as show cause notice and reply be filed within 2 weeks with the respondent from today.
13. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 21.01.2026 at 2.00 pm.contd. 5

: 5 :

14. 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
06.01.2026

A.No. 207/25 & 208/25

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Vivek Chandrasekar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Shubham Sharma, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Id. counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Rohit Kumar Modi, Ld. counsel for the intervener joined through VC.

Fresh Vakalatnama is filed on behalf of the appellant.

Ld counsel for the appellant submits that he has been recently engaged and seeks some time to inspect the record and address the arguments.

At request, put up for arguments on **18.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026

A.No. 384/25

06.01.2026

Present : Sh. Som Dutt Sharma and Ms. Bhumi Panjwani, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Submissions heard. Appellant states that he is ready to demolish the property or let the respondent to demolish the property which is lying sealed since the year 2013.

It is also stated that two applications were filed with the respondent in this regard, but no response has been received.

Ld. counsel for the respondent is directed to take instructions from the department as to whether the appellant should be given permission to demolish the property and if not, reasons thereof should be specified.

Put up for further proceedings on **05.02.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
06.01.2026