

A.No. 57/26

27.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Bijay 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 **03.06.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 02.12.2025. 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
27.01.2026

A.No. 723/25

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. G.M. Farooqui, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has passed away and he will move appropriate application for impleadment of his L.Rs.

Let the application be filed within 2 weeks.

Put up for further proceedings on **19.02.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 18/26

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Rakesh Kumar, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Vasu Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent along with
Sh. Shivam Moga, JE(B).

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The record has been produced. It be deposited with
Registry.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as
main counsel has suffered from food-poisoning and is not
available 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 interim application as well as
appeal on **13.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 491/12 & 519/12

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. K.N. Singh and Sh. Prabhnoor Singh, Ld counsels for the appellant.

Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 491/12.

Sh. Mohit Sharma, Id. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 519/12.

Part arguments heard at length.

Put up for further arguments on **03.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 555/13, 558/13, 563/13, 565/13 & 566/13

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Yakesh Anand along with Sh. Akshay Thakur, Ld counsels for the appellants through VC and is also an appellant in appeal no. 558/13 through VC.
Sh. Mohit Sham, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 558/13 and 566/23.
Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 565/13.

Part arguments heard.

An affidavit of legal heirs of late Sh. Rajeev Sawhney in appeal no. 555/13 has been filed as directed by my Id.

Predecessor on 28.03.2025. Same is taken on record.

Perusal of the record shows that the application for impleadment of L.Rs was already allowed on 23.05.2019.

Written synopsis filed by the appellant in appeal no. 558/13, 565/13 and 566/13. Copy supplied.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to argue physically.

This appeals are of the year 2013. However, in the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is given to the appellant for advancing arguments on **19.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 372/16

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Bhagat Singh, LR of the appellant, who is also appearing as counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Vinod Singh Rana, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Piyush Jain, counsel for the DDA.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Kumar Yuvraj, Ld. counsel for proposed intervener through VC.

An application under Order XXII rule 3 CPC to bring on record legal heirs of appellant late Sh. Jagjit Singh is pending. Arguments heard on this application. This appeal was preferred by Sh. Jagjit Singh for himself and as an attorney of other co-owners namely Smt. Jitender Kaur, Sh. Bhupender Singh and one Mr. Samarjit Singh. This application has been preferred by Mr. Bhagat Singh, son of Late Sh. Jagjit Singh. He has also placed on record the photocopy of the registered Power of Attorney executed in his favour by Smt. Jitender Kaur, Sh. Bhupender Singh and one Mr. Samarjit Singh. This application has been moved to continue with this appeal by Mr. Bhagat Singh as an attorney of Smt. Jitender Kaur, Sh. Bhupender Singh and Mr. Samarjit Singh and as Class-I legal heir of late appellant Sh. Jagjit Singh.

...contd.2

: 2 :

Ld. counsel appearing for the proposed intervener Smt. Jitender Kaur, Sh. Bhupender Singh and Mr. Samarjit Singh, submits that there is an arbitral award in their favour qua this property and the applicant Bhagat Singh has challenged this Award before the Hon'ble High Court and he will be filing an application for impleadment.

In these facts, the present application of Mr. Bhagat Singh is allowed and he is permitted to continue with this appeal as an legal heirs of the late appellant Mr. Jagjit Singh.

At request, put up for arguments on the appeal on **07.04.2026.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 489/16

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Ashish Dubey, HR Manager for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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

Appeal pertains to the year 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 **24.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 935/16

Kailash Balani Vs. MCD

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Parvez Bashista and Sh. Malag Misra, Ld counsels
for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

None has appeared for the respondent despite repeated calls since morning. It is already 2.20 pm.

Arguments heard.

The appellant is concerned only about second and third floor of property bearing no. B-13, Chirag Enclave, New Delhi and has challenged the demolition order dated 21.09.2016 wherein the property was directed to be demolished.

It is argued for the appellant that the first floor and the second floor of the property are old and occupied much prior to 07.02.2007 and are protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

I have perused the record.

The impugned demolition order in respect of second and the third floor records that the sanctioned area for the second floor is 282.24 sq.mtrs against the existing area of 322.85 sq. mtrs, and there is no sanctioned area for the

....contd.2

: 2 :

third floor yet there is existing area of 106.63 sq.mtrs. on the third floor and therefore, same are deviations against the sanctioned building plan and unauthorized construction, which are liable to be demolished.

The appellant has drawn my attention to the sale deed dated 23.01.2006 vide which the appellant purchased the property. As per this sale deed, the appellant purchased entire second floor consisting of four bed rooms, five toilets, one drawing-cum-dining room, one kitchen and entrance lobby, two servant quarters with common toilet on the terrace of the second floor i.e. third floor. It shows that as on 23.01.2006 this construction was existing.

The sale deed further shows that the first floor owner purchased one servant quarter with common toilet on the terrace of the second floor. This shows that there were 3 servant quarters on the terrace floor along with common toilet. The appellant purchased two out of three 3 servant quarters and one servant quarter was purchased by the owner of the first floor. As such, this much construction was existing on the second and third floor of the property. The booking through show cause notice dated 23.03.2016 mentions unauthorized construction of four rooms, three toilets, one hall temporary at third floor (old

...contd.3

: 3 :

and occupied). The respondent itself records this construction on the third floor as old and occupied. The documents of the appellant show three servant quarters and a toilet on the third floor on 23.01.2006. The construction existing on the third floor is old and occupied much prior to 07.02.2007 and is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

In these facts, the demolition order is upheld, but is kept in abeyance for the second and third floor only 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.

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
27.01.2026

A.No. 189/17

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Tarun Chaudhary, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is unable to appear today due to bad weather and due to certain medical emergency.

The appeal pertains to the year 2017. However, In the interest of justice one more opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter.

Put up for arguments on **28.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 209/18 & 210/18

27.01.2026

Present : Ms. Ashu Arora, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Appellant Mahesh Gupta in person. .
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal and Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld counsel for
the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

At request, put up for further arguments on **09.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 599/18

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Surender Chauhan and Ms. Nisha, Ld. counsels for the appellant.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Yogender Singh, AE(B) .

At request, put up with the connected appeals i.e. appeal numbers 653/18 & 851/18 for arguments on **22.04.2026**.
Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 653/18 & 851/18

27.01.2026

Present : Ms. Nisha, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent
along with Sh. Yogender Singh, AE(B) .

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks time to file the status report regarding remand back of appeal no. 852/18. Let the same be so filed on or before the next date of hearing.

An adjournment is also sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is busy before some other 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 **22.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 78/20
Bhola Singh Lodhi Vs. MCD

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. R.K. Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard. File perused.

The impugned demolition order dated 30.01.2020 in respect of first floor and second floor room of property no. A-361/2, Shastri Nagar, Delhi is under challenge on several grounds including that the same is in existence prior to 07.02.2007 and is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

During the course of hearing, the house tax record of the property was summoned and was tagged with this appeal.

The house tax record shows that on 10.05.2003, an inspection of the subject property was carried out and there existed two rooms with lobby and toilet on the first floor and one room on the second floor as on May 2003. The same is reflected as it is in the site plan filed with the appeal. There is no material on record in the office file to show that any fresh construction was going on in the property when it was booked on 20.11.2019. The ground

....contd.2

: 2 :

floor of the property was protected in the demolition order under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

In view of the house tax inspection record, it is established *ex facie* that the entire construction upto a room on the second floor is prior to 07.02.2007 and is therefore, protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. The demolition order is however upheld but 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 is allowed.

Record of the respondent as well as record of the house tax departments, 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
27.01.2026

A.No. 195/20 & 196/20

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Rakesh Tikku, Ld. senior counsel along with Sh. Monu Kumar, for the appellant.
Sh. Nilesh Sahni, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Dharmbir Singh Consultant, NDMC.

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

Put up for arguments on **20.03.2026**, for awaiting powers.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 23/22

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. S.S. Chauhan, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

An adjournment is sought by Id. counsel for the appellant as he could not prepare his arguments because of his ailment.

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 **04.06.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 672/22 & 673/22

27.01.2026

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

Arguments on behalf of the appellant heard.

None has appeared for the respondent despite repeated calls since morning. It is already 2.30 pm.

In the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is granted to the respondent to address arguments on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further arguments on **02.06.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 174/23

27.01.2026

Present : Appellant in person.
Sh. Anubhav Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent
through VC.

An adjournment is sought by the appellant as his 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 **05.06.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 342/23

Ram Prakash and Anr. Vs. MCD

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Kapil Yadav, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC
Sh. Sanjay Sethi, Ld. counsel for the respondent along
with Ms. Sarita Gaur, ALO for the respondent along with
Sh. H.D. Bhardwaj, AE(B).

Arguments on behalf of the appellant heard.

The appellant has challenged the demolition order dated 25.05.2023 on several grounds including that his reply to the show cause notice was not considered nor opportunity of personal hearing was provided.

Ld. counsel for the respondent on the other hand has argued that the appellant did not mention any relevant fact in his reply including the submission that the property is old and occupied and is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 and therefore, even if, the reply would have been considered, the result would be the same.

I have perused the office file. The show cause notice dated 15.05.2023 was duly replied by the appellant on 19.05.2023 and 27.05.2023. The demolition order dated 25.05.2023 was passed with noting that no reply has

....contd.2

: 2 :

been submitted. Whether there were any merits in the reply or not, the Quasi Judicial Authority is bound to consider the reply and mention by giving speaking order as to why the reply is not satisfactory.

Further, the opportunity of personal hearing was not provided. The replies are available in the office record, yet were not considered. In these facts, the demolition order dated 25.05.2023 is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the replies dated 19.05.2023 and 27.05.2023 submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant and after giving opportunity to file the documents to the appellant.

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 17.02.2026 at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

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
27.01.2026

A.No. 1046/17

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Nitin Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

At request, put up for further arguments on **17.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 100/24

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Sudhir Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as counsel is not available in post-lunch sessions due to some personal difficulty.

None has appeared for the respondent despite repeated calls since morning. It is already 2.35 pm. Issue notice to the respondent for ensuring the presence of the counsel on the next date of hearing.

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
27.01.2026

A.No. 1020/24

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Devender Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as counsel for the appellant is not available in post lunch sessions 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 **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
27.01.2026

A.No. 42/25 & 43/25

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Dinesh Kumar, Ms. Chetna Chauhdary, Sh. Garvit Singh and Sh. Saurabh Puri, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellants as counsels are not available in post-lunch sessions.

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 **31.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 353/25 & 354/25

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Rakesh Tikku, Ld. senior counsel along with Sh. Monu Kumar, for the appellant.
Sh. Sanjay Sharma, Ld counsels for the respondent through VC in appeal no. 353/25.
Sh. Jasman Singh Sethi, Ld counsels for the respondent through VC in appeal no. 354/25.
Sh. Dharambir Singh, Consultant, NDMC in person.

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

Put up for arguments on **20.03.2026**, for awaiting powers.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 392/25 & 393/25
Mohd. Shahid Vs. MCD

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. C. Prakash, Ld. counsel for the appellant along with the appellant.
Sh. Kamal Kishore Okharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Ld. proxy counsel for the intervener.

Reply to the application under Order I rule 10 CPC filed.
Copy placed on record.

Arguments heard.

1. The appellant has challenged the demolition order dated 24.04.2025 and sealing order dated 29.05.2025 passed in respect of property no. 514/35 and 515/35, Onkar Nagar, Tri Nagar, Delhi-110035. It was argued for the appellant that he has sanctioned building plan for these two properties and was raising construction as per law, yet neither the show cause notice was served nor the impugned orders and the properties were booked and sealed without any basis. It was also argued that the appellant is ready to regularize the compoundable deviations/construction as per law.
2. Ld. counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the sanctioned building plan was sanctioned on 03.03.2025 separately for these two properties, yet the appellant amalgamated these two

...contd.2

properties and there are projections on the municipal land at the front side and on the right side of the properties at stilt floor which are non-compoundable and therefore, the properties were booked and these two orders were passed. The show cause notice were duly delivered through post as well as pasting and therefore, there are no merits in these appeals.

3. I have perused the office record.
4. The properties were booked for the unauthorized construction through show cause notice dated 26.03.2025 in the form of deviations against sanctioned building plan no. 20017926 and 20017952 in the shape of amalgamation of the property no. 514 and 515 and projections on the municipal land. This show cause notice was sent by post to Nasib Shree from whom the appellant claims to have purchased the property. The appellant never informed the respondent that he has purchased the property. The sanctioned building plan was issued in the name of one Nasib Shree and show cause notice was rightly sent to him and to one Shewta Yadav, the owner of property no. 515. The same were duly delivered through speed post as per the Track consignment report. In pursuance to that, the demolition order

...contd.3

dated 24.04.2025 was passed which was also delivered through speed post and was also served through pasting at site. Admittedly, it is a case of fresh construction and therefore, protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 is not available. The photographs in the booking file and the sealing file show that the two properties no. 514 and 515 have been amalgamated despite having separate building plans. There exists projection on the municipal land on the front and right side. These deviations are unauthorized construction and non-compoundable and cannot be protected.

5. Coming to the sealing file, the show cause notice dated 21.04.2025 was duly received by one Raj Kumar and was also served by way of pasting. Since no response was received, the sealing order dated 02.06.2025 was passed. The property was sealed on 02.06.2025. There are no merits in the arguments that the show cause notice or the sealing order were not served.
6. Ld. counsel for the respondent has also drawn my attention to para 6-E of the appeal. The appellant states in this para that construction activity was started in the month of February 2025 after obtaining sanctioned building plan. The same is contrary to the record as the

...contd. 4

: 4 :

sanctioned building plan was passed separately for two properties on 03.03.2025 and not before 01.03.2025, despite that the construction was started in February 2025. It is also relevant to mention that the appellant has not filed any document in respect of ownership of the property no. 515 and as on date, he is the owner of only property no. 514 and therefore, how he is aggrieved in respect of property no. 515 is not explained.

7. In view of this discussions, there are no merit in the aforesaid appeals. These appeals are accordingly dismissed.
8. Demolition order and sealing order are upheld.
9. 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
27.01.2026

A.No. 410/25

27.01.2026

Present : Sh. Jitesh Kumar Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

Ms. Shika Gupta, Ld. counsel for the appellant.

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

Status report is filed by the MCD. Copy supplied.

The record has been produced. It be deposited with Registry.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to go through the status report and record.

At request, 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
27.01.2026

A.No. 549/25 & 550/25

27.01.2026

Present : Ms. Sonia Mendiratta and Sh. Ashmeet Singh Saib, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Ms. Harita Mehta, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.
Ms. Jyoti Kumar, Ld. proxy counsel for the respondent in person.

Status report is filed by the MCD. Copy placed on record.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the appellant that they are not available in post-lunch sessions due to some personal difficulty.

At request, put up for arguments on **11.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026

A.No. 640/14 & 756/14

27.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
 Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in
 appeal no. 640/14.
 Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld.counsel for the respondent in
 appeal no. 756/14.

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

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
27.01.2026