

A.No. 52/26

22.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Surinder Kumar Bhasin and Sh. Sanjay Kumar, 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 **04.05.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken  
against the property of appellant bearing property no. B-  
8, Khasra no. 33/22, Chander Vihar, Nilothi Extension,  
New Delhi-110041 in pursuance of the impugned undated  
demolition order. However, it is made clear that no  
encroachment on the public land is protected. The  
appellant is directed not to raise any further construction  
in the property in question.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 53/26

Balwant Singh Ramola and Anr. Vs. MCD

22.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Anupam Jindal, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

This is an appeal challenging the demolition order dated 20.05.2022. It is stated that this order was earlier challenged in appeal no. 300/22, which was dismissed in default because of ailment of the appellant. Since, already an appeal was filed against this order, second appeal against the same order is not maintainable and the appellant is required to file appropriate application seeking restoration of that appeal. It is stated that same shall be filed by today/tomorrow.

In these facts, this appeal is dismissed as not maintainable. However, the respondent is restrained from taking any action against the property of the appellant for a week in pursuance of the vacation notice dated 15.01.2026.

Appeal stands disposed of as 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  
22.01.2026

A.No. 54/26

22.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Hemant Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

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

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

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **06.05.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 09.12.2025. However, it is made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected. The appellant is directed not to raise any further construction in the property in question.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 501/22 & 502/22

22.01.2026

Present : Ms. Aditi Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Files are taken up today on application(s) of early hearing filed on behalf of the appellant.

Notice of this application(s) be issued to the respondent/MCD for **09.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 362/24

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Abhishek Chandel, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Appellant in person.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD along with two coloured photographs. Copy supplied to the appellant.

As per the respondent, entire non-compoundable deviations i.e extended slab of second floor (front side), hanging staircase at rear side from second to third floor have not been demolished.

The appellant claims that he has already demolished these deviations and the respondent on every date of hearing adds one more non-compoundable deviation in their status report.

The appellant is directed to file photographs that these two non-compoundable deviations mentioned hereinabove have been demolished.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 713/25 & 472/25  
Gulam Hussain Vs. MCD

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Rishabh Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Sanjay Sethi, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 713/25.  
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Id. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 472/25.  
Sh. Anil Bansal, AE(B), MCD Central Zone.

Joint status report filed by the respondent. Copy supplied.

Copy of this status report is also kept in appeal no. 713/25.

Heard. File perused.

The aforesaid appeal bearing no. 472/25 is against the vacation notice dated 11.07.2025, which is not appealable before this Tribunal. The appeal is dismissed with liberty to challenge the demolition/sealing order as per law.

**Appeal bearing no. 472/25 stands disposed of.**

At request, put up for arguments in another appeal bearing no. 713/25, on **30.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 874/14

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **23.01.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 625/16, 492/19 & 35/20

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Anmol Singh, Ld. counsel for the appellant in appeal no. 625/16 & 492/19.  
Ms. Aditi Aggarwal, Id. counsel for appellant in appeal no. 35/20.  
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 625/16.  
Sh. Rajas Sharma, Id. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 492/19.  
Sh. Vikas Khatri, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further arguments on **21.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026



A.No. 874/16 & 875/16

22.01.2026

Present : Ms. Jahnvi Garg, proxy counsel for Sh. Shiv Charan Garg, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta and Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsels for the respondent.

Adjournment sought on behalf of the appellant on the ground that counsel has recently been engaged and counsel seeks time to file vakalatnama and to inspect the record.

Same is strongly opposed.

Record shows that a cost of Rs. 5,000/- was imposed on the appellant on 07.06.2022 for seeking adjournment and thereafter of Rs.10,000/- on 15.12.2022 on the same ground. Later, it was reported by the respondent that the demolished portion has been reconstructed, for which the appellant was directed to appear in person and since he failed, a cost of Rs. 2,000/- was imposed. The appellant thereafter was directed on 19.12.2023 to file affidavit to explain as to how the demolished portion has been reconstructed. This order has not been complied and a new counsel has appeared for the appellant on 19.12.2024 and sought adjournment.

....contd.2

: 2 :

Today, after more than a year from 19.12.2024, a new counsel has been engaged, who seeks adjournment. The appellant appears to be making every effort to delay the matter and has not even filed the affidavit as per the order dated 19.12.2023.

Infacts, there are no grounds to adjourn the matter as the appellant has been changing counsel regularly and that too just very near to the date of hearing only to seek adjournment.

In the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is given to the appellant for arguments subject to cost of Rs. 20,000/- to be deposited with Registry and it is made clear that adjournment shall not be allowed on the ground of change of counsel.

Put up for arguments on **26.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 140/17  
Rajkumari Singh and Ors. Vs. MCD

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Sudhir Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant along with  
appellants no. 1 and 2.  
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Both the appellants, who are present in person, submits  
that they want to withdraw the aforesaid appeal and they  
may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

Joint statement of both the appellants recorded  
separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by the appellants  
themselves, 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  
22.01.2026

A.No. 436/17

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Lokesh Khanna, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.  
Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld. counsel for the respondent no. 3, 4 and 5 and newly impleaded respondent Swaran Lata.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has re-filed the amended memo of parties. I have seen the same. The same is totally wrong as it does not mention the names of the existing appellant and respondent. Same is returned with direction to file proper memo of parties.

Ld. counsel for the appellant further submits that legal heirs of late Sh. Prem Prakash are required to be impleaded. My attention has been drawn to the order dated 03.05.2023 wherein it is stated that the appellant does not want to implead the legal heirs.

Appellant is given last and final opportunity to argue on merits irrespective of the fact whether application for impleadment of L.Rs. of Prem Prakash is filed or not.

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  
22.01.2026

A.No. 366/18

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Kunal Kalra, Ld. counsel for the appellant through VC.

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

It is stated that the appellant no. 1 has passed away and Id. counsel will take steps to implead the legal heirs.

Let the same be taken as per law.

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  
22.01.2026

A.No. 426/19  
Naresh Kumar Aggarwal and Anr. Vs. MCD

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant along with  
appellant .  
Sh. Chetan Hasija, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard. File perused.

The show cause notice dated 14.06.2019 is claimed to be served by way of affixation upon the appellant, who is concerned about the first and second floor of the property bearing no. C-6, Kailash Colony, Delhi.

On the last date of hearing, the respondent was directed to apprise as to on which floor of the property, this show cause notice was pasted to serve the appellant. There is nothing on record in this regard, nor any photographs are taken or are existing on record.

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks presence of AE(B) concerned to throw light on this aspect. The record of this case has already been submitted and the concerned AE(B), who is now stated to be transferred, can only assist the court from the record only as it relates to the year 2019. There is nothing on record to show the service of the show cause notice on the appellant. More so, when the appellant claims that he has strained relations with the residents of the ground floor.

....contd.2

: 2 :

In these facts, the demolition order dated 27.06.2019 is set aside only in respect of first and second floor of the property with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply to be filed by the appellant within four week from today and after giving personal hearing to the appellant.

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 20.02.2026 at 2.00 pm with his reply and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

Appeal stands allowed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 107/21  
Vinod Kumar Sharma Vs. MCD

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. K.N. Singh and Sh. Prabhnoor Singh, Ld counsels for the appellant along with son of the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard on the appeal.

The appellant, who is a tenant on the ground floor shop measuring about 12 x 9 feet in property no. 74/02, East Moti Bagh, Sarai Rohilla, Delhi-10007 has challenged the impugned demolition order dated 16.02.2021 passed in respect of the deviations against the sanctioned building plan at stilt level.

The documents filed by the appellant, which are the rent receipts and the electricity bills, show that this shop is in existence at least since 1999. The landlord later on obtained a sanctioned building plan for the entire property and showed this ground floor as stilt and constructed the property without demolishing the shop in question as per his new sanctioned building plan. That sanctioned building plan was later on revoked and the property was booked afresh for the other floors at well vide show cause notice dated 02.09.2021 and second demolition order dated 08.11.2024 for the entire property was passed.

...contd.2



: 2 :

Admittedly, the shop in question exists prior to the cut off date of 08.02.2007 and is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. The new sanctioned building plan has been revoked and entire construction stands booked subsequently.

It appears that the landlord tried to evict the appellant by taking recourse to reconstruct the property after obtaining sanctioned building plan. Since, the shop of the appellant on the ground floor is old and occupied much prior to 08.02.2007, the same is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. However, the demolition order dated 16.02.2021 is upheld but kept in abeyance in respect of shop 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.

The appeal stands allowed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 110/21

22.01.2026

Present :

Sh. Nishant Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Ms. Praveen Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent  
through VC.

Arguments heard on the applications seeking condonation of delay of about 2 years and 5 months in filing the aforesaid appeals.

The property of the appellant is lying sealed since 11.09.2017 and the husband of the appellant also filed application before the respondent for desealing of the property and it cannot be believed that there was no knowledge. The grounds on which the condonation of delay has been sought regarding the ailment and death of the husband are not supported by the relevant documents, but considering the fact that dismissing this appeal on the ground of delay, shall result in irreparable injury to the appellant that the property will remain sealed for all times to come without any adjudication on merits of the appeal, the inordinate delay from 18.09.2017 till 15.03.2020 is condoned subject to the cost of Rs. 5,000/- to be deposited with Registry.

Put up for arguments on the appeal on **15.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 37/22

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Rambir Chauhan, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard on the applications seeking condonation of delay in filing the aforesaid appeals. The impugned demolition order is dated 03.10.2019. The appeal was filed on 28.01.2022, but the appellant is required to explain the delay only till 15.03.2020 as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India exempted the period between 15.03.2020 to 28.02.2022 for the purpose of limitation in Suo Moto Writ Petition no. 3/2020.

Coming to the delay from 09.10.2019 till 15.03.2020, the appellant who is differently-abled person initially approached some other authorities like Mayor, DC MCD and was under the belief that his grievance shall be resolved. Without going into the merits of the submission and with an endeavour to decide the appeals on merits, the delay between 09.10.2019 to 15.03.2020, which cannot be said to be inordinate, is condoned subject to deposit a cost of Rs. 2,000/- with the Registry. The applications stand disposed of.

...contd.2

: 2 :

At request, put up for arguments on appeal 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  
22.01.2026

A.No. 481/22  
Sanjeev Kumar Verma vs. MCD

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant along with both the appellants.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal and Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsels for the respondent.  
Sh. Mahipal Singh Rajput, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

An application under Section 379 BNSS along with documents filed by the intervener. Copy supplied. In support of his application/arguments, Id. counsel for the intervener has relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in '***N. Natarajan Vs. B.K.Subba Rao, AIR 2003 Supreme Court 541***'

Appellants have already filed an application to withdraw this appeal. The appellants, who are present in person, submit that they want to withdraw the aforesaid appeal in view of the status report filed by the respondent and they may be permitted to withdraw the same.

Statement of the both the appellants recorded separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by the appellants themselves, the aforesaid appeal is disposed off as withdrawn. The application seeking withdrawal of the appeal also stands disposed of.

...contd.2

: 2 :

Coming to the application of the intervener, the intervener was never made a party to this litigation.

Arguments on this application heard.

This court for the first time vide order dated 17.05.2024 sought specific report from the respondent as to whether the property of the appellant has been booked or not considering that the appellant claimed that there are more than one property bearing no. WZ-130D, Narayana Village and for the first time in pursuance to this order, the respondent physically carried out inspection through present JE(B) and earlier JE(B) to ascertain as to which of the several property no. WZ-130D was booked and also prepared a rough sketch and reported that there are at least five properties bearing the same number and the property of one Kartar Singh was booked and not of the appellant.

In view of that report, I do not find that there was any deliberate or intentional act on the behalf of the MCD or the appellant to place false status report before the court that the property of the appellant has been book. None of the notices and the orders were in the name of the appellant. The same were issued as owner/occupant of property no. WZ-130D. The application claiming that

...contd.3

: 3 :

there was intentional misrepresentation before this court by the appellant and the respondent/MCD is baseless and therefore, is devoid of merits and 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  
22.01.2026

A.No. 583/22

22.01.2026

Present : Ms. Mamta Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant along  
with appellant.  
Sh. S. Adil Hussain, Ld counsel for the respondent.  
Sh. M.M. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further arguments on **02.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026



A.No. 465/23

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Sanjeev Sahay, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

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 **29.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 466/23

Sh. Jayakumar R Nair Vs. MCD

22.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.

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/22.01.26

At 2.40 pm

Present : None for the appellant.

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 the last two consecutive dates as well.

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

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

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

22.01.2026

A.No. 517/23, 518/23, 519/23 & 360/24

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Shadan Farasat, Ld. Senior counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 360/24.  
None for the respondent in appeal no. 518/23.  
Sh. Ankur Sharma, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 517/23 & 519/23.  
Sh. Vishal Maan, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the appellant as he is held up before the Hon'ble CAT.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **20.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD/  
22.01.2026

A.No. 567/23 & 628/23

22.01.2026

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

None has appeared for the appellant despite repeated calls since morning. Hence, the Interim protection stands vacated.

Put up for arguments on **29.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 636/23

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Yogender Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard on the applications seeking condonation of delay of about 11 months in filing the aforesaid appeals.

It is stated for the appellant that after revocation of his sanctioned building plan, he approached his architect, who informed the appellant that he will take care of this revocation by filing representation and thereafter, the said architect has passed away, which came to the knowledge of the appellant only on 25.08.2023 and immediately thereafter, this appeal was filed against the revocation order dated 29.08.2022 and therefore, the delay should be condoned. Reliance has been placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in ***Ramnath Sao Vs. Gobardhan Sao, in Civil Appeal no. 1704/02 dated 27.02.2002.***

Ld. counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that after revocation of the sanctioned building plan, the respondent passed further orders against the property

...contd.2

: 2 :

like demolition order etc. and if the revocation is now challenged, the same shall cause irreparable loss to the respondent.

Though, no documents have been filed to support the plea taken by the appellant, yet with an endeavour to decide the appeals on merits, the delay is condoned subject to deposit a cost of Rs. 5,000/- in appeal to be deposited with the Registry.

The applications stand disposed of.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 665/23

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Shubhank D. Patle, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.

None for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is un-available today due to bad health.

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

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

At request, put up for arguments on **30.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 670/23, 695/23, 696/23 & 698/23

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Yash Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant in appeal no. 670/23.  
Sh. Ravinder Singh, Ld. counsel for the appellant in appeals no. 695/23, 696/23 & 698/23 through VC.  
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 670/23 through VC.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 696/23.  
Sh. Vishal Chaudhary, Ld. Proxy counsel for Ms. Bhavya Chauhan, counsel for the MCD in appeal no. 695/23.  
None for the respondent in appeal no. 698/23.

Part arguments heard.

At request, put up for further 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  
22.01.2026



A.No. 731/24

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Ayaz Ahmad, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Sagar Dhama, Ld counsel for the respondent along  
with Sh. Mohd. Asif, AE(B).

Part arguments heard.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks adjournment to file  
documents to show that the first and second floor of the  
property exists prior to 08.02.2007.

At request, put up for further arguments on **30.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 927/24

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Kunal Malik, Ld counsel for the appellant with Sh. Navel Kishore.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Id. counsel for the respondent/MCD.  
Sh. Pradeep Kumar and Ms. Parul, Ld counsel for the respondent 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9A and 9B.  
Sh. Punesh Grover, Ld. counsel for the respondent no. 4 and 5.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders 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  
22.01.2026

A.No. 962/24

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Vishal Maan, Ld. counsel for the appellant.  
Ms. Mehvish, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent.  
Sh. Shadan Farasat, Ld. counsel for the intervener through VC.

An application under Section 347-C DMC Act filed by the appellant to place on record the additional documents alongwith documents. Copy supplied to the proxy counsel for the Intervener, who is present in the court. Let one copy of the same be also supplied to the counsel for the MCD.

At request made by the Ld. counsel for the intervener in connected appeals, put up for arguments on this application as well as on appeal on **20.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 1016/24

22.01.2026

Present : Ms. Neha Praveen, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is un-available today due to bad health.

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

Put up for arguments on **28.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 1045/24

22.01.2026

Present : Dr. Monika Singhal along with Sh. Abhishek, Ld counsel  
for the appellant along with appellant.  
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

The respondent was directed to file the status report in  
respect of sealing order which was remanded back on  
04.09.2024 in appeal no. 516/23.

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks time to file the said  
report.

It is stated for the respondent that this appeal is barred by  
limitation and no application has been filed.

Record shows that the same has been filed along with  
appeal. Let a copy of the same be supplied to the Id.  
counsel for the respondent.

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  
22.01.2026

A.No. 58/25

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Saikat Gangopadhyay and Sh. Shashank Rai, Ld  
counsels for the appellant.  
Sh. Rajas Sharma, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent  
through VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as  
main counsel Sh. Ajay Gaur, is not available today due to  
bad health.

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 **30.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 211/25

22.01.2026

Present :

Sh. Rishabh Kapoor, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

Sh. Chetan Hasija, Ld counsel for the respondent. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

An application has been filed by the appellant seeking inspection of her property to ascertain the deviations as compared to sanctioned building plan. The demolition order records that the JE(B) concerned made three efforts to inspect the property, but on two occasions, the property was found locked and on one date, the appellant did not allow to carry out inspection.

Though, it is the appellant herself who is responsible for not getting the property inspected, yet the same is essential to ascertain the exact deviations in the subject property. In-facts, the JE(B) concerned is directed to inspect the property of the appellant on 03.02.2026 at 2.00 pm and JE(B) will file the report regarding deviations in the property viz-a-viz the sanctioned building plan on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further proceedings on **12.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 307/25 & 308/25

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Sanjay Sethi, Ld counsel for the respondent.  
Ms. Diksha Punia, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to inspect the record.

At request, put up for arguments on the applications under Order I rule 10 CPC & u/s 151 CPC as well as on appeal on **30.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026



A.No. 515/25

22.01.2026

Present : Ms. Ruby, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. Vishal Chaudhary, Ld. proxy counsel for Ms. Bhavya Chauhan, Ld. counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Subodh Hathwal, AE(B), SS Zone, MCD.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy placed on record.  
Let the same be collected.

Record is stated to be filed in appeal no. 494/25. Let this appeal be also listed for arguments with that appeal on **17.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026

A.No. 236/17 & 262/17

22.01.2026

Present : Sh. D.P.S. Guliani, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in  
appeal no. 236/17.  
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld. counsel for the respondent in  
appeal no. 262/17.

No time left.

Put up for orders on **23.01.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
22.01.2026