A.No. 9/26

12.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, 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 **25.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No.13/26

12.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Badri Das, 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 **27.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 30.12.2025. 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
12.01.2026

A.No. 48/23
Anil Chhabra Vs. MCD

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Kunal Kalra, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Appellant in person.
Sh. R.K. Jain, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Ld. counsel for the appellant as well as appellant submit that all the non-compoundable deviations and encroachments have been removed by him and his property has already been desealed and in view of this, he wants to withdraw the aforesaid appeal and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeals.

Statement of the appellant recorded separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by the appellant, the aforesaid appeal is disposed off as withdrawn.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 727/25

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. P.P. Singh, Bhati, Ld. counsel for the appellant along with appellant in person.

File is taken up today on an application of early hearing filed on behalf of the appellant.

Issue notice of this application to the respondent for **19.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 841/25

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Ashkrit Tiwari, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

File is taken up today on an application of urgent hearing seeking stay of show cause notice issued under Section 345-A DMC Act dated 03.11.25 filed on behalf of the appellant.

This is an appeal challenging the demolition order and the show cause notice qua sealing proceedings cannot be stayed in this file/appeal.

Application stands dismissed.

Put up on the date fixed i.e. **14.05.2026** for the purpose fixed.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 328/14, 145/15 & 802/14

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Amit Sethi, Mr. B. Anand and Sh. Neeraj Kargeti, Ld counsels for the appellant.

Sh. Sanjay Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent /NDMCC along with Sh. Ashok Kumar, ASO, NDMC.

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

Put up for arguments on **20.04.2026,** for awaiting powers.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 859/15, 860/15, 861/15, 877/15, 881/15, 931/15, 395/16 & 398/16
GTL Infrastructure Ltd./Chennai Network Infrastructure Ltd. Vs. MCD

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Ankit Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent in appeal no. 859/15, 877/15 & 861/15.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 398/16.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 395/16.
Sh. Sagar Dhama, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 931/15,
None for the respondent in appeal no. 860/15.
None for the respondent in appeal no. & 881/15.

Arguments heard at length.

1. Vide this common judgment, I shall decide these 8 appeals since not only the parties are same, the issue involved in all these appeals is same i.e. whether the sealing order in respect of telecom towers owned by the appellants is sustainable or not and the grounds of appeal are more or less common in all appeals.
2. The appellants in these appeals have challenged the following sealing orders.

   (i). Appeal No. 881/15 sealing order dated 18.08.2015.

   (ii). Appeal No. 861/15 sealing order dated 25.04.2014.

(iii). Appeal No. 860/15 sealing odder dated 10.10.2014.

(iv). Appeal No. 859/15 sealing order dated 14.10.2014.

(v). Appeal No. 398/16 sealing order dated 03.09.2015.

(vi). Appeal No. 395/16 sealing order dated 29.09.2015.

(vii). Appeal No. 931/15 sealing order dated 14.09.2015.

(viii). Appeal No. 877/15 sealing order dated 08.09.2015.

3. These sealing orders have been passed in respect of telecom towers installed in different premises at different location in Delhi. without any permission from the respondent.

4. In these appeals the appellant have challenged the sealing orders on common grounds i.e. the show cause notices and the sealing orders were never served. The sealing orders are non-speaking orders without specifying the reasons of sealing. The appellants submitted all the requisite documents seeking permission for installation of telecom towers like NOC, stability certificate and permission from DPCC, yet the telecom towers were sealed. The installation of these telecom towers are governed under old policy of the

respondent of year 2002. The new policy of year 2010 was challenged before Hon'ble High Court and the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi stayed the new policy. The rejection of the regularization application was without any show cause notice nor any hearing was provided before passing the sealing orders and therefore it was submitted that the sealing orders should be set-aside.

5. Ld counsels for the respondent on the other hand argued that no prior permission was obtained for installation of telecom towers. The installation for the towers was unauthorized. The show cause notices and sealing orders were duly sent by speed post to Aircel Ltd. who installed the telecom towers. The appellants subsequently, took over from Aircel and cannot claim that show cause notices or the sealing orders were not served. It was further stated that matter was settled between respondent and appellants before Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in LPA no. 572/11 and as per this settlement and the order dated 28.08.2017 passed in that LPA, the appellants were required to file fresh application for regularization of telecom towers. The appellants failed to file any such application as per settlement agreement between the parties and therefore these appeals are without merits and should be dismissed.

6. This arguments has been rebutted by the appellants by stating that no fresh application was required to be filed as the installation of telecommunication towers of the appellants 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.
7. 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 were 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.

8. It is also matter of record that the appellant in appeal no. 398/16, as mentioned in the order-sheet dated 16.02.2024 has filed fresh application in terms of this settlement. All 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. 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. The appellants cannot pray for desealing of their telecom towers or for setting aside the sealing orders without taking permission from the respondent in terms of settlement arrived between the parties in LPA 572/11. After this settlement both the parties are bound by the terms of the settlement as per order of Hon'ble High Court dated 28.08.2017.
10. As far as service of show cause notices and sealing orders are concerned, as per office record same were sent to the Aircel as well as the owners of the property through speed post and the speed post receipts are available in all the files. There is presumption of service under Section 27 of General Clauses Act. In appeal no. 395/16, show cause notice was even replied which was issued to Aircel Ltd.
11. All the appeal are therefore without merits and are dismissed.
12. 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
12.01.2026

A.No. 882/17

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Sumit Rana, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Record was sent back when the appeal was dismissed in default. Let the record be summoned afresh for next date of hearing.

Record of appeal no. 883/17 which was withdrawn on 11.10.2022 be also tagged with this file.

At request, put up for arguments on **12.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 344/18

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Anil Kumar, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
None for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is held up before the Saket District Court.
Even none has appeared for the respondent today and also on 02.04.2025. Issue notice to the respondent for assuring appearance of the counsel to advance arguments on the next date of hearing.
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 **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
12.01.2026

A.No. 88/20 & 89/20

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Raj Kumar Yadav, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. proxy counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Ashish Upadhyay, Ld. counsel for the applicant/ intervener along with intervener.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as father of the appellant has expired.
An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Ashutosh Gupta is held up before the Saket District Court.
Same is strongly opposed on behalf of the intervener.
In the interest of justice one last and final opportunity is granted to the parties to address the arguments in the matter.
Put up for arguments on **24.02.2026**.
Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 92/20, 127/20 & 260/20

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Arun Vohra, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ranjeet Pandey , Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

It is stated for the appellant that appellant wants to demolish the entire property, but could not do so as it is lying sealed and has already approached the respondent on 04.12.2025 for desealing the property to demolish the property and then to reconstruct it after obtaining appropriate sanction. Copy of the said letter has been placed on record.

Let the said letter be verified and status report qua this letter, if filed by the appellant, be also filed on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further proceedings on **20.01.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 27/22, 28/22, 151/22 & 152/22

12.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Mohd. Nazim, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

Be awaited for 12.00 noon.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

At 12.35 pm

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Mohd. Nazim, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

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

No adverse order is being passed today and the appellant is given last and final opportunity to advance arguments on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **05.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 457/22

12.01.2026

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

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

No adverse order is being passed today and one last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address arguments on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **25.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 501/22 & 502/22

12.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Rajat Rajoria Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

None has appeared for the appellant despite repeated calls since morning.
No adverse order is being passed today and one last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address arguments on the next date of hearing.
Put up for arguments on **22.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 57/23 & 347/23

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Praveen Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. proxy counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard on the appellant.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Ashutosh Gupta is held up before the Saket Court and is not available today.

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 **22.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 449/23

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Pankaj Riyad, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant through VC.

Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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

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 **23.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 536/23

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Anish Chawla, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

Ms. Suhasini Singh, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.

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

Sh. Sanjeev Sindhwani, Ld. Senior counsel for the respondent no. 2 along with respondent no. 2 through VC.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has placed on record copy of the two letters issued by the appellant to the MCD dated 16.05.2024 and 31.05.2024. Copy supplied.

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
12.01.2026

A.No. 706/23

12.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

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

No adverse order is being passed today and one last and final opportunity is given to the appellant to address arguments on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on 13.07.2026.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 79/24

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Sushil Vashisht , Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Anupam Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent/DDA.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Rambir Chauhan is un-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 **13.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 97/24
Firoza Begum Vs. MCD

12.01.2026
Present : Sh. Sandeep Khatri, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

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

Arguments heard on the appeal. File perused.

The impugned show cause notice and demolition order records that there is unauthorized construction from ground to fourth floor of the property no. 2913, Shahganj, Ajmeri Gate, Delhi-110006. The same however is silent in respect of the alleged date or period during which the said unauthorized construction was raised in the property. The property was booked on the basis of writ petition being filed before the Hon'ble High Court by one Nazir Ahmad bearing W.P.(C) no. 3910/23. The appellant has relied upon a property tax receipt of the year 2004-05 to show that the construction from ground to fourth floor existed prior to 08.02.2007.

It was argued for the respondent that apart from this receipt, there is no document on record filed by the appellant to show that the construction upto fourth floor is old and occupied, which at the time of sale deed dated 06.08.2001 in favour of the appellant, was only up to third floor terrace.

….contd.2

Though, it is correct that apart from this house-tax receipt, there is no document on record to show that the construction is prior to 08.02.007, but this property tax receipt issued by the respondent may be through a private agency hired by the respondent at the relevant time, is sufficient to show that the construction up to fourth floor existed prior to 08.02.2007. The respondent at the time of booking or at any time prior to that did not take any photographs to show that the unauthorized construction is being done in the property to ascertain the date of said unauthorized construction. In the absence of any material in the office file to establish that any fresh construction was raised after 08.02.2007, the construction as existed in the property is entitled to be protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 till the act is in force. The demolition order dated 13.06.2023 is kept in abeyance 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.

….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
12.01.2026

A.No. 861/24

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Yogendra Tripathi, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant along with husband of the appellant in person.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

The appellant has not filed documents as per the order dated 13.12.2024. The counsel is not available today being held up before Hon'ble High Court.

The appellant is given last opportunity to file that document failing which adverse inference shall be drawn against him.

Put up for arguments on appeal as last and final opportunity on **01.06.2024**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 401/24

12.01.2026

Present : Ms. Aeshna Salwan, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Sanjay Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent /NDMCC along with Sh. Ashok Kumar, ASO, NDMC.

Powers in respect of the matters of NDMC not yet received.
Put up for arguments on **27.04.2026,** for awaiting powers.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 479/24, 622/24 & 623/24

12.01.2026
Present : Sh. Manoj Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellants.
Sh. Syad Adil Hussain , Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Arshi Arora, ld. counsel for the intervener.

An application under Order I rule 10 CPC filed on behalf of the applicant/intervener in appeal no. 622/24. Copy supplied.

Arguments heard on the applications seeking condonation of delay in filing the appeal no. 623/24. The demolition order dated 01.07.,2024 was challenged in the appeal filed on 06.08.2024. During the intervening period, this Tribunal was vacant and the appellant approached the Hon'ble High Court vide a writ petition bearing W.P.(C) no. 9352/2024, where in para 7, it was recorded by the Hon'ble High Court that the Presiding Officer is likely to resume functioning in the present case. In these facts, the delay is condoned.

The application stands disposed of.

At request put up for arguments on the application as well as appeals on **21.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 684/24

12.01.2026

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

Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

Sh. Chetan Hasija, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Sh. Rakesh Walia, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

It is submitted that the intervener has passed away.

It is stated by Sh. Atul Tanwar, counsel for the respondent that he has received this brief yesterday evening and some time is sought to file the status report in compliance to the order dated 06.05.2025.

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

Put up for arguments on the appeal on **21.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 873/24 & 908/24

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Rahul Bharti, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 873/24.
Sh. Raujas Sharma, Ld.proxy counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 908/24.

Ld. proxy counsel for the appeal seeks pass over in the matter.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent in appeal no. 873/24 as main counsel Sh. Ashutosh Gupta is held up before the Saket District Court and an adjournment is also sought on behalf of the respondent in appeal no 908/24 as mother of main counsel Sh. Ajay Gaur has expired.

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 **21.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 886/24

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Sourav Ghosh, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Sh. V.K. Aggarwal , Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. S.K. Mishra, ALO and Sh. Faiz Ahmed Baksh, AE(B).

Part arguments heard.

Status report is filed by the respondent/MCD, copy supplied.

At request, put up for further arguments on **16.02.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 1060/24

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Arun Kumar, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

It is stated for the appellant that that reply of the respondent to the appeal is awaited as mentioned in order dated 26.05.2025.

MCD is already filed its record and status report and no separate reply is to be filed.

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

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 39/25

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Himanshu Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Anupam Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent /DDA.

Status report is filed by the DDA, copy supplied.

Allotment of the subject property is in dispute.

Appellant is directed to be present with original documents of the property in question, in the court on **17.02.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 431/25

12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Rishi Sood , Ld counsel for the appellant.
Proxy counsel for the respondent through VC.
Mohd. Hafizuddin Khan, Ld. counsel for the applicant/ intervener.

An application under Order I rule 10 CPC has already been filed by intervener Rahimuddin. Let the copy be supplied to the counsel for the appellant and respondent.
Reply if any, to this application be filed with advance copy to the opposite side.
MCD is also directed to file the status report as per the order dated 23.07.2025.
Put up for arguments on this application as well as 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
12.01.2026

A.No. 539/25 & 540/25
12.01.2026

Present : Sh. Praveen Suri, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

Ld counsel for the appellant seeks pass-over for 03.30 PM as he is busy before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India

On request, put up at 03.30 PM

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

At 03.30 PM

Present : Sh. Praveen Suri, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC along with Sh. Sagar Nandwani, Advocate present in the court.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent.

Ld counsel for the appellant submits that he is just free from the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and will not be able to reach in time before court.

At request, put up for further arguments on **02.02.2026.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.01.2026

A.No. 515/18

12.01.2026

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

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present appeal is 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
12.01.2026