

A.No. 15/26

15.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Lovee Tyagi, 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 **07.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the Rejection Order dated 16.12.2025. 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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 23/26

15.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, 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 **16.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the impugned demolition orders dated 12.09.2025 and 05.12.2025, if relates to the property of the appellant. 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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 24/26

15.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Ira Arora and Sh. Saksham Mittal, 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 **02.03.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 31.12.2025. 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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 432/25

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Gourav, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Ms. Jasleen Kaur, Ld counsel for the respondent. Fresh  
Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

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

Ld. counsel for the respondent also seeks time to file the  
status report and record. Let the same be filed.

At request, put up for arguments 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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 876/25

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Sumit Rana, Ld counsel for the appellant.

File is taken up today on the application of early hearing and an application to place on record the additional documents, filed on behalf of the appellant.

Issue notice of both these applications to the respondent for **09.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

A.No. 930/15 & 5/16

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal and Sh. Pulkit Garg, (Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Adv.) Ld. counsels for the respondent in appeal no. 930/15.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 5/16.

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

The appeals pertain to the year 2015 and 2016. However, 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 **03.02.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

A.No. 356/17 & 448/17  
**Padma Devi Vs MCD**

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

- 1 Arguments heard at length.
- 2 These are two appeals challenging the demolition order dated 26.05.2017 in appeal No.448/17 and the revocation of sanctioned building plan vide order dated 05.05.2017 in appeal No.356/17.
- 3 The demolition order has been challenged on the ground amongst other that same is non-speaking order and records that reply received but found not satisfactory. It was argued that a detailed reply running into more than 14 pages was submitted by the appellant to the show cause notice dated 11.05.2017 but despite that detailed reply non-speaking order was passed. Ld. counsel for the appellant in this regard has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble High Court passed in case of Jaspal Singh Jolly Vs MCD 125 (2005) DLT 592.
- 4 Ld. counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that though in the order it is mentioned that the

Contd....2/-

:: 2 ::

reply was not satisfactory but the reply was considered and thereafter the demolition order was passed and therefore, there are no merits in this arguments.

- 5 I have perused the record. The Quasi Judicial Authority is required to pass speaking order after dealing with the contentions raised by the appellant in the detailed reply. The order cannot be sustained once it is non-speaking and does not spell out the reasons while dealing with the contentions of the reply.
- 6 The Hon'ble Division Bench of Hon'ble Delhi High Court in W.P.(C) 3636/24 tilted as Real Steel Tyre Company Vs The Principal Commissioner of GST vide order dated 13.03.2024 has held in Para -5 that the order saying reply was unsatisfactory ex-facie shows that there was no application of mind to the reply of the petitioner. In view of this law the demolition order is not sustainable.
- 7 Coming to the other appeal challenging the revocation order, the respondent filed its status report on 22.02.2024 admitting that the reply to the show cause notice dated 31.03.2017 was not considered while passing the revocation order. It was mentioned that this reply was mixed up with their files and could not

Contd....3/-

:: 3 ::

be placed in the relevant file before passing the impugned revocation order. In this appeal also it has been stated that even if the reply would have been considered the conclusion of the revocation order shall remain the same as there was misrepresentation of facts.

- 8 Irrespective of the conclusion, the respondent was legally bound to consider the reply of the appellant and provide personal hearing to the appellant before passing the revocation order. The respondent cannot claim that though the reply was not considered being misplaced yet the result would have been same. The appeal challenging the revocation order therefore is to be allowed on the same ground as was in the demolition appeal that the reply was not considered.
- 9 In these facts both the appeals are allowed the matters are remanded back with the directions to the respondent to pass speaking orders after considering the reply submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on **05.02.2026 at 2.00 pm** and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

Contd...4/-

:: 4 ::

10 The appeal stands allowed.

11 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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 363/18 & 562/18  
Deputy Chhatwani Vs. MCD

15.01.2026

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. H.R. Agarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

1. Arguments heard.
2. The appellant has challenged the demolition order dated 14.01.2017 in appeal no. 363/18 and the sealing order dated 12.12.2017 in appeal no. 562/18 primarily on the ground that neither the show cause notices nor the two impugned orders were served upon the appellant. It was argued that same were sent through speed post to one Mr. Tameer who is neither connected with the property nor known to the appellant and therefore no opportunity of hearing was provided to the appellant and the order should be set-aside.
3. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that Mr. Tameer was the builder who raised the unauthorized construction on behalf of the appellant and was duly served through speed post and the appellant chose not to file any representation nor appeared before Quasi Judicial Authority and therefore was properly served.

4. It was also argued that despite initial booking on 03.10.2017 of unauthorized construction of the ground and first floor, the appellant continued with the unauthorized construction and the property was again booked on 14.11.2017 for unauthorized construction on second and third floor and later was partially demolished and sealed and therefore the appeals should be dismissed.
5. I have perused the record. As per record, the show cause notices and impugned orders were sent to one Mr Tameer by speed post. Not only that there is no tracking report of the speed post but also there is no material on record to establish that Mr. Tameer to whom these notices and orders were addressed was builder of the subject property. The appellant in the appeal has categorically stated that Mr. Tameer is a stranger to him and had no concern with the property of appellant. The burden of the proving Mr. Tameer was the builder or connected to the subject property was on the respondent. In the official notings, it is nowhere recorded that during inspection, Mr Tameer was found raising construction at the property. In absence of any material to connect Mr. Tameer with the subject property or with the appellant, it prima-facie appear that show cause notices and the demolition orders were not served upon the appellant.

6. In these facts, both the appeal are allowed and the matters are remanded-back with the directions to the respondent to give opportunity to the appellant to file reply to the show cause notices and also give personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear with reply and documents before the respondent on **02.02.2026 at 02.00 PM** and after providing personal hearing, the respondent shall pass speaking order within four weeks of conclusion of personal hearing.
7. 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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 343/19

15.01.2026

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

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

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 **09.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

A.No. 290/20, 291/20 & 394/20

15.01.2026

Present : Ms. Nisha Chauhan, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant through VC.

Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent along with Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, Adv..

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as the main counsel, who was hospitalized, has been discharged from the hospital only yesterday.

The appeals pertain to the year 2020. However, in the interest of justice one more opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **16.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

**A.No. 284/21 & 286/21  
Dharamwati Vs. MCD**

**A.No. 285/21 & 287/21  
Chaman Singh Vs. MCD**

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 284/21 & 285/21.

1. Arguments heard.
2. These are two appeals challenging the demolition order dated 25.08.2021 in appeal No.286/21 and 287/21 passed in respect of property No.161/2 out of Khasra No.93, New Usman Pur Delhi and the other two appeals challenging the revocation of the sanctioned building plan vide order dated 09.07.2021 passed in respect of property of the respective portions of the appellants. The demolition order has been challenged on the ground that the personal hearing was provided to the appellant by an officer who did not pass the impugned demolition order and therefore the same is liable to be set aside in view of the judgment of Hon'ble Delhi High Court in the case of Sudesh Kumar Vs SDMC dated 22.12.2020 in CM (M) 500/2020.

Contd. 2/-

:: 2 ::

3. I have perused the office record of the respondent where at page No.13/N it has been recorded by the AE(B) that personal hearing was given to the appellant on 04.08.2021 by the predecessor of the AE(B) who passed the order. The AE(B) who passed the order did not give any personal hearing and passed the order on the basis of reply submitted by the appellants. The Hon'ble High Court in the Judgment relied upon by Ld. counsel for the appellants was pleased to set aside the demolition order on the ground that the officer who passed the order was not the officer who granted hearing to the petitioner therein. The facts before me are exactly same where the hearing to the appellants was given by some other officer and the demolition order was passed by some other officer.
4. In view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court, the impugned demolition order dated 25.08.2021 is set aside and the matters are remanded back with the directions to the respondent to give personal hearing to the appellants and thereafter passed the speaking order which should be by the same officer who will provide personal hearing to the appellants. The appellants shall appear before the

Contd... 3/-

:: 3 ::

Quasi Judicial Authority for personal hearing on **03.02.2026 at 2.00 p.m.** and speaking order be passed within six weeks of conclusion of the personal hearing.

5. Coming to the appeals challenging the revocation order dated 09.07.2021, the revocation order was passed primarily on the ground that the plot of the appellants is earmarked for community facility / park etc and that there was sub-division of the plot but no application for recognition of sub-division was submitted in the Town Planning Department. During the pendency of these appeals status report was sought from the Town Planning Department and vide status report dated 07.08.2024 it was reported by the Town Planning Department that the area where the plot of the appellants is located may not be treated as a park since this colony has later grown up in the shape of unauthorized colony. This status report of the Town Planning Department shows that the plot of the appellant can no longer be treated as park and therefore, the ground of revocation of the sanctioned building plan is not correct.
6. The other ground of the revocation is the sub-division of plot. The impugned revocation order records that

Contd.. 4/-

:: 4 ::

as per GPA and Sale Agreement and Will of Mahinder Singh in favour of Chaman Singh, the plot of 120 sq. yds. has been carved out from the plot of 1000 sq.yds. in the year 2001- 2002. This sub-division therefore was much prior to the cut off date of 17.01.2011. In the Circular dated 09.12.2011 issued by the Town Planning Department No.TP/UT/4095/11 it has been mentioned at regulation No.3 that in case of extended Lal Dora, Special Area, the sub-division shall be treated as per notification of 17.01.2011. The plot of the appellant even as per the impugned revocation order was sub-divided much prior in the year 2001- 2002 and therefore, the sub-division of the plot prior to 17.01.2011 has to be recognized by the respondent and sanctioned building plan cannot be revoked on this ground.

7. In these facts, the appeals are allowed and the revocation of sanctioned building plan of the appellant bearing property No.161/2 out of Khasra No.93, New Usman Pur is set aside. The appeals are allowed and the sanctioned building plan obtained by the appellants under Saral Scheme is held to be valid.

Contd...5/-

:: 5 ::

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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 319/21 & 402/21

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Sanam Malhotra, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Rohan Nagar, Ld. Proxy counsel for Ms. Vasu Singh,  
counsel for the respondent through VC.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that wrong site plan was filed on record in haste and he seeks permission to file the correct site plan. The same should have been filed by now as these appeals are pending since 2021. However, in-facts put up for arguments on **14.05.2026**. Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

A.No. 703/23, 649/23 & 704/23

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Vishu Mittal, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 703/23 & 649/23.  
Ms. Praveen Sharma, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 704/23 through VC.  
None for the intervener.

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

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

Put up for arguments on application under Order I rule 10 CPC and appeal on **09.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

A.No. 47/23

15.01.2026

Present : Ms. Anjali Kumari, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal and Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, Ld counsel  
for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Sunil Kumar Kalra is not available today due to bad health. On the last date, adjournment was sought on the ground that counsel Sh. Gaurav Kochar is not well.

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 **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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 734/23

15.01.2026

Present : Appellant in person.  
Sh. Vijay Tyagi, Ld counsel for the respondent through  
VC.  
Sh. Sudhir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the applicant/  
intervener.

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

Same is opposed by the Ld. counsel for the intervener.

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 **07.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

**A.No. 791/23**

**Rajeev Kumar and Anr. Vs. MCD**

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Arvind Kumar Gupta, Sh. Ishan Parashar and Sh. Rishi Bhardwaj, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. Syed Adil Hussain, Ld counsel for the respondent/MCD.  
Sh. Gaurav Dua, Ld. counsel for the respondent no. 2.

Matter is listed for submissions on the *locus standi* of the appellant to file this appeal as per order dated 07.04.2025.

1. It is argued for the appellants that they are on the ground floor of the property and are aggrieved as the demolition order has protected the unauthorized construction on the first and second floor of the property under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 being existing prior to 01.06.2014 and therefore, they have every right to challenge this order being aggrieved and permitted under Section 343 (2) of DMC Act.
2. It was stated that the appellants filed a civil suit against the unauthorized construction in the property and the respondent/MCD in collusion with the respondent no. 2 has protected the construction on

....contd.2

the first and second floor unlawfully despite that the construction was raised much after 01.06.2014 and therefore, the appellants have locus to file this appeal.

3. On behalf of the respondent no. 2 against whom, this demolition order dated 02.06.2023 has been passed, it has been argued that appellants have no locus to file this appeal in view of the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in case ***Hardayal Singh Mehta Vs MCD, AIR 1990 Delhi 170.***
4. I have perused the record. The impugned demolition order dated 02.06.2023 has protected the construction existing on the first and second floor of the property on the ground that same is in existence prior to cut off date of 01.06.2014. The respondent no. 2 was directed to demolish the construction on the third floor being not protected. The Hon'ble High Court in the judgment of Hardayal Singh Mehta (supra) in para 24 has defined as to who can be person aggrieved as contemplated under Sub-Section (2) of Section 343 DMC Act. The Hon'ble High Court observed as under :-

"Sub-section (2) of Section 343 gives a right to the "person aggrieved" by the order of the Commissioner to prefer an appeal to the Tribunal. It is obvious that the person

....contd.3

: 3 :

aggrieved will be only he whose building is sought to be demolished and not any other person who may be interested, for whatever reasons, to get the building demolished."

5. In view of this law, appellants cannot be person aggrieved as the demolition order was not passed against their property. Their grievance is that the property was wrongfully protected and they cannot be aggrieved persons as defined under Section 343 (2) DMC Act. It is also relevant to mention that the appellants earlier undertook before the Civil Court that they would withdraw this appeal as mentioned in the order dated 27.05.2024, but later chose not to withdraw this appeal and the same reflects that the appellants are not aggrieved by the demolition order, but have every intention to get the property demolished because of strained relations with the respondent no. 2 who is their relative. The appellants have therefore, no *locus standi* to file this appeal. The appeal is dismissed.
6. 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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 139/24  
Udham Singh Vs. MCD

15.01.2026

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent along  
with Sh. Shailender Singh, AE(B), Shahdara Zone.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

As per the status report dated 15.01.2026, the property in  
question has already been regularized.

In view of the above, Id. counsel for the appellant submits  
that she has instructions from the appellant to withdraw  
the aforesaid appeal and she may be permitted to  
withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

Statement of Id. counsel for the appellant recorded  
separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by the Id. counsel for 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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 172/24 & 173/24

15.01.2026

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
None for the respondent.

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for arguments on **28.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

A.No. 572/24

15.01.2026

Present :        None for the appellant.  
                  Ms. Anshika, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Atul Tanwar,  
                  counsel for the respondent through VC.

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for arguments on **13.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

A.No. 863/24 : Usha Gupta Vs.MCD  
A. No.864/24 : Poonam Vs. MCD

15.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.  
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal and Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, Ld counsel  
for the respondent.

File perused.

The aforesaid appeals are against the vacation notice(s) dated 09.08.2024, which are not appealable before this Tribunal. The appeals are dismissed with liberty to challenge the demolition/sealing order, if any, as per law. 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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 87/25 & 239/25

15.01.2026

Present : Son of the appellant in person.  
Ms. Anshika, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Atul Tanwar, counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 87/25 through VC.  
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 239/25.  
Ms. Seema Gupta, Ld. counsel for the intervener in appeal no. 87/25.

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 more opportunity is granted to the appellant 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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 127/25

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Puneet Goel, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent.

An application under Order VII rule 14 CPC filed by the appellant to place on record the additional documents is pending.

Reply to this application filed. Copy supplied.

Without prejudice to the rights of the respondent, the documents are taken on record. The application stands disposed of.

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

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the impugned order. However, it is made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

A.No. 130/25 & 142/25

15.01.2026

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

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

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 **15.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

A.No. 149/25

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Anupam Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent.  
Sh. Puneet Goel, Id. counsel for the applicant/intervener.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, is held up before the Hon'ble High Court.

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 **17.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

A.No. 421/25

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Vinay Chaudhary, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent. Fresh  
Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

Time sought on behalf of the appellant to inspect the  
record submitted by the MCD.

Let the same be inspected.

At request, put up for arguments on **16.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
15.01.2026

A.No. 445/25

15.01.2026

Present : Ms. Sonia Mendiratta, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Pritish Sabharwal and Sh Sanjeet Kumar, Ld counsels for the respondent.

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

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

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  
15.01.2026

A.No. 714/22

15.01.2026

Present : Sh. Yogendra Gautam, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Pukit Garg, Ld Proxy counsel for the respondent.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present appeal is 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  
15.01.2026