

A.No. 46/26

20.01.2026

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.

Appellant is also directed to file the affidavit mentioning the construction existing in the property whether it is tin-shed construction or any other type of construction.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **10.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 47/26 & 48/26

20.01.2026

Fresh appeals received. It be checked and registered.

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

Submissions heard. File perused.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent through concerned Chief Law officer.

The Executive Engineer (B) is directed to ensure the presence of the concerned AE(B), who shall appear in person along with the record of the proceedings, status report and reply on next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **20.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the 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
20.01.2026

A.No. 49/26

20.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Rambir Chauhan, 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 Legal Advisor, DDA.
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 **23.03.2026**.
Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant consisting of Khasra no. 25//21 min. 22, 23 & 35//1 min, 2, 3 near Pushta Road, Burari Village Salempur, Majra Burari, Delhi-110084 in pursuance of the demolition order No. DA04(12)2025/LM/CZ/34 dated 13.01.2026. 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
20.01.2026

A.No. 50/26

20.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Ran Vijay Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent through concerned Chief Law officer.

The Executive Engineer (B) is directed to ensure the presence of the concerned AE(B), who shall appear in person along with the record of the proceedings, status report and reply on next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **21.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 18.11.2025. 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
20.01.2026

A.No. 51/26

20.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

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

Submissions heard. File perused.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent through concerned Chief Law officer.

The Executive Engineer (B) is directed to ensure the presence of the concerned AE(B), who shall appear in person along with the record of the proceedings, status report and reply on next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **17.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, status quo in respect of the property of appellant be maintained.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 92/20 : Jairaj Developers LLP Vs. MCD

A. No.127/20 : Jairaj Developers LLP Vs. MCD

A. No.260/20 : Jairaj Developers LLP Vs. MCD

20.01.2026

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

The appellant has already written a letter to the Dy. Commissioner concerned to deseal the property so that same can be demolished and thereafter reconstruct the same as per law.

Ld. counsel for the respondent submits that till these appeals are pending and the matter is subjudice, the properties cannot be desealed temporarily for the purpose of demolition and the appellant is required to withdraw these appeals and thereafter he can approach the respondent for desealing the property for the purpose of demolition.

The appellant on the last date of hearing placed on record the copy of the letter dated 04.12.2025 written to the concerned Dy. Commissioner with request to deseal the property so that it can be demolished and thereafter, new building can be constructed after getting fresh approval from the department.

...contd.2

: 2 :

Since, the appellant intends to demolish the property and raise fresh construction as per the law, all the three impugned orders i.e. demolition order dated 27.02.2020, sealing order dated 28.09.2020 and rejection order dated 01.02.2019 are upheld. **All the three appeals are dismissed.**

It is specified that the respondent shall consider the application of the appellant seeking demolition of the property favorably and will pass orders on their applications within reasonable time.

If the appellant fails to demolish the property within 3 months after it is desealed, the respondent shall be at liberty to demolish the property or reseal the same 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
20.01.2026

A.No. 936/24
Ajit Singh Vs. MCD

20.01.2026

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

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that he has instructions from the appellant to withdraw the aforesaid appeal and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

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

In view of the statement made by the ld. 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
20.01.2026

A.No. 571/25
Ankush Garg and Anr. Vs. MCD

20.01.2026

Present : Ms. Maahi Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

Ld. 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 ld. counsel for the appellant recorded separately to this effect.

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

Appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 833/25
Mohd. Saleem Qureshi Vs. MCD

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi , Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, proxy counsel for Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent along with Sh. Vikas Kumar, MTS.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The record has been produced.

As per the status report, the application of the appellant for reopening his regularization application is still under consideration. In view of the same, the record is handed over back to the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

In the sale deed executed for the third floor in favour of the appellant, there appears to be a typographical mistake in respect of the percentage of undivided share in the land of the plot. As per the stamp duty paid by the appellant and as per the agreement to sell, the appellant has 25% undivided share in the land which has been inadvertently typed as 5% undivided share in the sale deed. The respondent shall consider this aspect while deciding the regularization application.

...contd.2

: 2 :

As far as, the unauthorized construction on the fourth floor is concerned, the occupant of the ground floor has no objection, if the same is demolished. The appellant submits that it could be demolished completely because of restriction imposed under GRAP and shall remove the same within a week of lifting of restrictions under GRAP. Since, the regularization application is still pending, this appeal is without cause of action.

At this stage, Ld. counsel for the appellants submits that he has instructions from the appellant to withdraw the aforesaid appeal in view of the aforesaid status report and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

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

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

Appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 4/26 & 5/26
Neema Devi and Ors. Vs. MCD

20.01.2026

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

It is stated for the respondent that the matter has been
marked to the counsel today morning only and some time
is required to submit the record and report.

Infacts, no coercive action be taken against the property
of the appellants till next date of hearing.

Put up for filing of report/record as well as arguments on
15.04.2026.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 596/16

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Sudesh Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld. counsel for the intervener in appeal no. 596/16.

As, the regularization application filed by the appellant is pending before the MCD, the matter is adjourned.

Put up for further proceedings awaiting the outcome of the said application 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
20.01.2026

A.No. 597/16

Mohd. Saleem Qureshi Vs. MCD

20.01.2026

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

Ms. Sudesh Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

This is an appeal challenging the order dated 30.03.2016 vide which the application of the appellant seeking regularization of the construction was rejected.

Subsequent to filing of this appeal, the appellant again applied for regularization of the construction which is still pending before the respondent.

Since, fresh regularization application filed by the appellant is still pending, the present appeal challenging the earlier rejection dated 30.03.2016 has now become infructuous as fresh order will give a fresh cause of action.

In this facts, this appeal is dismissed being infructuous.

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
20.01.2026

A.No. 856/17

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Sanjeev Bahl, 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 appellant as main counsel Sh. R.K. Jain is held up before the Hon'ble High Court. Similar request is made on behalf of the respondent.

The appeal pertains to the year 2017. However, 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 **20.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 504/18 & 513/18

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Abhishek Chandel, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld. counsel for the respondent through VC in appeal no. 504/18.
Sh. Ranjeet Pandey, Ld. counsel for the respondent thorough VC in appeal no. 513/18,

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Ms. Ashu Arora is not available today due to ill health.

The appeal pertains to the year 2018. 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 **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
20.01.2026

A.No. 500/19

20.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Pukit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent.

None has appeared for the appellant since morning despite calls till 2.00 p.m.

The appellant sought adjournment on the last date of hearing. This appeal is of the year 2019.

In the interest of justice subject to the cost of Rs.5,000/- to be deposited with the Registry of this Court, last and final opportunity is given to the appellant address the arguments on **29.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 114/20
Shakeel Ahmed and Ors. Vs. MCD

20.01.2026

Present : Appellant in person.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard on the appeal.

The property was sealed on 16.10.2019 because of misuser for being used for commercial purposes for running a scrap unit from the property.

As per status report dated 13.04.2023 the appellant is required to pay misuser charges of 2,40,000/- in view of the Annexure-I with that status report. The area of the property of the appellant is 64.89 sq.mtrs and the misuser charges are payable at Rs.10,000/- per month or Rs. 2,40,000/- whichever is lower. The respondent has sought misuser charges which are the maximum as per this annexure.

The appellant as per documents filed got the property through GPA, Agreement to sell etc on 20.06.2018 and the electricity was energized on 30.10.2018. The property therefore, was under misuse from 30.10.2018 till it was sealed on 16.10.2019 for 12 months. The appellant therefore, is required to pay misuser charges @ Rs./ 10,000/- per month for 12 months i.e. Rs.1,20,000/-.

...contd.2

: 2 :

The appellant seeks time to pay this amount. He is directed to deposit this amount and produce the receipt on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further proceedings on **25.05.2026**.

Copy of the order be given dasti for compliance.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 430/22

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Sudershan Tyagi, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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

Appellant is given last and final opportunity to address the arguments.

Put up for arguments on **19.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

Misc. Application 55/23 in appeal No. 786/22

Anupama Khanna Vs Sh. Gyanesh Bharti, IAS

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Umesh Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Appellant through VC.
None for the respondent.

None has appeared for respondent despite waiting and call till 2.50 p.m.

Arguments heard.

This is an application of the appellant in appeal No.786/22 seeking contempt proceedings against the respondent for violating order dated 12.01.2023. It is stated in this application that vide order dated 12.01.2023 this Court directed the respondent to not to take coercive action qua the property in pursuant to demolition order dated 02.11.2022 yet the respondent on 08.08.2023 demolished substantial part of the property by breaking the gate of the house of the appellant.

None appeared for the respondent but from the reply filed to this application the respondent took the stand that this interim protection given on 12.01.2023 was not continued by this Court on the next date of hearing and therefore, the demolition action was taken on 08.08.2023. This interim order dated 12.01.12023 was only till 28.02.2023

which was the next date and was never extended and therefore, the application is devoid of merits.

I have perused the record of the appeal No.786/22. This Court vide order dated 12.01.2023 directed the respondent to not to take coercive action against the property till next date. The order says that the respondent be directed to specify as to when the third floor of the property was booked. Renotify on 28.02.2023 and till then no coercive action be taken.

This interim order dated 12.01.2023 was not extended on 28.02.2023 which was next date of hearing nor on 17.05.2023 which was the date thereafter. The proceedings dated 28.02.2023 and 17.05.2023 were duly attended by the counsel for the appellant but it was never requested to extend the interim protection given on 12.01.2023. The matter after 17.05.2023 was listed on 18.08.2023 and in between demolition action was taken on 08.08.2023. This application was filed on 18.08.2023. From the act of demolition which was taken on 08.08.2023 there appears to be no malafide intention of the respondent in taking demolition action. Though it would have been better with the respondent if this Court was informed before taking demolition action yet the demolition action which was taken on 08.08.2023 does not show that there was any deliberate violation of order dated 12.01.2023. Had there been any malafide on the part of the respondent, the demolition action would have

been taken immediately after 28.02.2023 when the interim protection given on 12.01.2023 was not extended. The respondent did not take any action after 28.02.2023 or immediately after 17.05.2023. There was no interim protection as on 08.08.2023 as claimed by the appellant. There is no cause of action to initiate contempt proceedings against the respondent as claimed in this application. Same is dismissed.

File be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 786/22
Anupama Khanna Vs. MCD

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Umesh Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant along with Appellant in person.
None for the respondent.

Appellant has filed an application to place on record Order of Hon'ble High Court dated 16.01.2024 and copy of FIR & Order dated 16.10.2025.

Arguments heard. None has appeared for respondent despite waiting and calls till 2.50 pm.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present appeal stands disposed of.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 6/23

Shri Vimal Khanna Vs MCD

20.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Pukit Garg, proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta,
Ld 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
20.01.2026

3.10 P.M.

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Pukit Garg, proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta,
Ld 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
17.09.2025 as well.

It is 3.10 P.M. 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
20.01.2026

A.No. 63/23, 424/23, 532/23 & 106/24

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Prem Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Vijay Tyagi, Ld counsel for the respondent through
VC in appeals no. 63/23 & 424/23.
None for the respondent in other two appeals.

Fresh Vakalatnama filed for the appellant. Same is taken on record.

Ld. counsel seeks time to argue as he has been recently engaged.

Though, arguments were advanced at length by both the parties on the last date of hearing, yet in the interest of justice, the appellant is given one last and final arguments to conclude the arguments on the next date of hearing.

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
20.01.2026

A.No. 85/23

20.01.2026

Present : Ms. Sana Ansari, Ld.counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for respondent.

Arguments heard on the application seeking condonation of delay in filing the appeal. The impugned demolition order dated 05.07.2018 has been challenged in this appeal filed on 17.02.2023. It is claimed for the appellant that demolition order was never served upon the appellant and show cause notice was pasted at site on 07.07.2018 which was replied by the appellant but prior to that the demolition order was passed and the appellant came to know about the demolition order only on 02.02.2023 through W.P.(C) 3133/2022 filed before the Hon'ble High Court.

Ld. counsel for the respondent is not available being held up before the Hon'ble High Court.

Put up for argument on this application on **17.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 403/23
Jalal Faruqui Vs.MCD

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Abhinav S. Raghuvanshi and Ms. Shweta, Ld counsels for the appellant along with appellant.
None for the respondent.

Arguments heard.

1. The appellant has challenged the demolition order dated 28.04.2023 booking unauthorized construction in the shape of excess coverage and deviations against standard plan of DDA with projections on public land.
2. The booking and the demolition order records that the same is old and occupied and property was booked because of a court case.
3. Ld. counsel for the appellant has drawn my attention to a reply given by the Building Departments dated 28.08.2019 filed before the Hon'ble LG of some public hearing. It was stated in that reply by the respondent that the building as well as construction is very old and on local inquiry, it reveals that it is 20 years old and is protected under the National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. Same stand was also taken by the respondent in Civil Suit no. 491/2022 in June 2022 by stating that the construction is old and occupied. The

respondent took the similar stand in their WS filed in that suit in September 2022.

4. However, this stand was changed in March 2023 in that suit only by stating that the owner/occupier has carried out certain changes in the structure. However, the impugned booking and the demolition order does not mention about those certain changes as claimed for the first time on 13.03.2023 in suit no. 491/22.
5. The office record does not mention about the details of these changes nor the dates nor there is any photographs to show that what changes were made and when these changes were made. The respondent took same stand that construction in the property of the appellant bearing flat no. 2-A, Pokcet A, DDA Flats, New Jafrabad, Delhi is old and occupied till its change its stand in March 2023.
6. There is nothing in the office record to show that the alleged changes were made in March 2023 as the booking itself says that it is on the basis of a court case/old and occupied. The construction therefore, is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. The demolition order is upheld. The impugned order 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.

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
20.01.2026

A.No. 415/23

20.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
 Sh. Syed Adil Hussain, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for arguments on **15.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 553/23, 963/24 & 1057/24
Rajesh Kumar Vs. MCD

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. P.S. Mehar and Sh. Shantwanu Singh, Ld counsels for the appellant.

Sh. Neetu, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 553/23.

Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 963/24.

Proxy counsel for Ms. Mehak Arora, counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 1057/24.

Arguments on behalf of the appellant heard.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondents as main counsel are not available today due to certain personal difficulty/ill-health/being held up before Hon'ble High Court.

In appeal no. 963/24 (Rajesh Kumar Vs. MCD), the rejection of the regularization application is under challenge. The respondent issued invalid notice on 01.08.2024 which was sent to the appellant through speed post on 03.08.2024 and same returned unserved on 07.08.2024 with the report 'incomplete address'. The appellant claims that neither invalid notice nor the rejection order dated 09.08.2024 was communicated to him.

....contd.2

: 2 :

As per the office noting, the invalid notice dated 01.08.2424 returned back due to 'unclaimed'. This noting dated 07.08.2025 is not correct since the invalid notice was returned because of incomplete address and not because of being unclaimed. The appellant did not get the opportunity to reply the invalid notice as it was not served.

In-facts, the respondent is directed to reopen the regularization application of the appellant and to decide the same. Since the copy of the invalid notice has now been received by the appellant, the appellant shall reply the same within 4 weeks from today and thereafter, the respondent shall decide the regularization application within reasonable time. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 23.02.2026 at 2.00 pm with his reply to invalid notice.

This appeal bearing no. 963/24 is disposed of as any fresh order shall give fresh cause of action to the appellant.

Record of the respondent, if any, in appeal no. 963/24 be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

In other two appeals bearing no. 553/23 & 1057/24, one more opportunity is granted to the respondent to address the arguments in the matter.

....contd.3

: 3 :

Put up for further arguments on **14.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 792/23, 794/23, 795/23, 796/23, 797/23 & 798/23

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Ashish Rohlania, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. G.D. Mishra, 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 appellant as main counsel is not available today due to ill health.

An adjournment is also sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel is held up before 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 **27.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 456/24, 457/24, 462/24 & 463/24

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Armaan, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 457/24, & 463/24
Ms. Mehak Arora, Ld. counsel for the respondent in 456/24 & 462/24

Part arguments on behalf of the appellant heard.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has questioned the jurisdiction of the MCD.

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

At request, put up for further arguments on **17.07.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the impugned order(s). 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
20.01.2026

A.No. 813/24

20.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Apoorv Sisodia, 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.

Put up for arguments on **28.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 1010/24

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Praveen Suri, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Manoj Pandey, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant with appellant in person.
None for the respondent.

Fresh Vakalatnama filed on behalf of the appellant. Same is taken on record.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks some time to inspect the record and to advance arguments.

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
20.01.2026

A.No. 249/25

20.01.2026

Present : Ms. Chanchal Sharma, Ld. counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Sagar Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent through
VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as
counsel is not feeling well today.

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 **24.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
20.01.2026

A.No. 279/25 & 306/25

20.01.2026

Present : Sh. Veeru Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Appellant present in the court submits that she does not want to continue with her appeals. She may be permitted to withdraw the appeals.

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

In view of the facts and circumstances, the appeal filed by the appellant is dismissed 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
20.01.2026