A.No. 64/26

29.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Mohd. Azam Ansari and Sh. Afjal Ansari, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

Heard. File perused.

The aforesaid appeal is against the vacation notice dated 03.11.2025 issued under Section 349 DMC Act. It is claimed that this appeal against the vacation notice is maintainable as per the orders of the Hon'ble High Court dated 13.01.2026. I have perused that order. The Hon'ble High Court has recorded that under Section 347-B (2), an appeal lies before this tribunal to be filed within 30 days from the date of notice. Section 347-B (1) provides the orders and notices which can be challenged before this Tribunal within 30 days. Notice under Section 349 DMC Act is not mentioned in Section 347-B (1) of the DMC Act and therefore, the appeal does not lie against this notice.

It is stated for the appellant that they have also challenged the demolition order dated 10.10.2016 and 29.03.2017 mentioned in this vacation notice, copy of which were never provided to him.

…contd.2

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 **12.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 66/26

29.01.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Sandeep Tyagi and Sh. Arun Sharma, 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 **15.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant bearing plot no. 4, Khasra no. 204/1-1 min. Village Sultanpur, Tehsil Mehrauli, New Delhi in pursuance of the demolition order dated 14.11.2023. The respondent is at liberty to take action against property mentioned in that 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
29.01.2026

A.No. 68/26 & 69/26

29.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Rajat Mathur, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

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 with other connected appeals on **28.05.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 06.11.2017. 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
29.01.2026

A.No. 70/26

29.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Nitin Kasara, Ankit Negi and Sh. Arun 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 **18.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 71/26

29.01.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Kartik Sharma, Sh. Aryan Shah, Ms. Vanshika Mathuria and Ms. Sapna Rai, 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 **26.05.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 30.12.2025. However, it is made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected. The appellant is directed not to raise any further construction in the property in question.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 13/15, 14/15 & 232/25

29.01.2026

Present : Proxy counsel for the appellant along with son of the appellant.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 13/15 & 14/15
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 232/25.

Ld. counsel for the respondent has stated that the regularization application of the appellant cannot be considered since in that application, regularization of the two rooms already partly demolished by the respondent, has also been sought. The appellant should seek sanction of those partly demolished rooms separately apart from getting the already constructed portion compounded.

Let the appellant take instructions in this regard and do the needful.

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

At request, put up for further proceedings 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
29.01.2026

A.No. 520/25

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Nikhil Rana, Ld. counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Shashank Chauhan and Sh. Adarsh Malik , Ld counsel for the appellant.

Copy of the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court in some writ petitions and contempt case placed on record by the appellant.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant on the ground that uncle of the counsel for the appellant has passed away yesterday morning.

Put up for consideration on **21.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 732/25

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Raj, Ld counsel for the appellant.

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

The next date of hearing in the matter is 03.02.2026. The appeal is of the year 2025. In view of the heavy pendency, no early hearing is possible. The application is dismissed.

Put up on the date fixed for the purpose fixed.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 786/25
Career Avenues Thr. Its Proprietor Dr. Sachin Vijay and Dr. Sadhana Sinha Vs. MCD

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Manish Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An application seeking condonation of delay in filing the appeal filed. Copy supplied.

Arguments heard on this application.

The property admittedly was sealed on 08.08.2025 and this appeal has been preferred on 18.11.2025 after a delay of 2 months and 10 days. The appellant claims that in between, he was pursuing with the respondent directly to deseal the property. In-facts, the delay is condoned subject to cost of Rs. 3,000/- to be deposited with the registry.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Record of respondent also produced.

Arguments heard. Record perused.

Along with the status report, the respondent has filed copy of an order passed by the Hon'ble High Court dated 03.09.2025 in W.P.(C) no. 8879/2025 relating to the property in dispute which is a Coaching Institute being run from the basement of the property no. P-6, Green Park Extension, New Delhi.

…contd.2

Ld. counsel for the appellant has relied upon note of clause 15.7.2 of MPD-2021 to argue that since the property Green Park Extension was developed prior to 1962, the minimum ROW of 9 meter is required for running a coaching center, unless lesser ROW is specified.

Documents have been placed on record in the form of Registered Sale deed of the year 1961 to establish that the Green Park Extension was a colony planned and developed prior to 1962. In these facts, the requirement of 18 meter ROW as mentioned for A and B category of colony in 15.7.2 shall not apply and the requirement of 9 meter ROW shall apply.

As far as the requirement of less than 20 students at a time in this Coaching Institute is concerned, there is no material on record nor is a ground in the show cause notice that more than 20 students at a time were present at this Coaching Centre. The appellant has already filed an affidavit to the effect that at a given time not more than 20 students are present in the Coaching Institute. The impugned order dated 16.06.2025 is also silent on this aspect as well as the office record of the respondent, where there is not even a whisper about the number of students. In these facts, a Coaching Centre from the

….contd.3

basement of the subject property is permissible under MPD-2021 specifically under the note of 15.7.2. The impugned sealing order is therefore, set aside. Let the property be desealed within a week from today.

The appellant however shall ensure that not more than 20 students are present in the coaching centre in a given point of time, failing which the respondent shall be at liberty to take action as per law.

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
29.01.2026

A.No. 10/26 (M)

29.01.2026

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

This is an application seeking execution of the Order dated 09.12.2025.

Let notice of this application be issued to the respondent for **10.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 649/13
Arun Singh Vs. MCD

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Rahul Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard.

The property was sealed on the directions of the Hon'ble Monitoring Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Later, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India permitted the aggrieved person(s) to approach this Tribunal and the respondent also published a public notice directing the aggrieved person(s) to approach this Tribunal within a month from the date of public notice.

In view of the same, this Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain this appeal.

The appellant who is concerned about a shop on the first floor of property no. C-1/2, Ring Road, Narayana Village, Delhi, has already deposited the misuser charges of Rs. 1,18,143/- which has been confirmed by the respondent.

The appellant shall give an undertaking, if already not given, with the respondent to not to misuse the property except those permitted under MPD-2021. The property therefore, is directed to be desealed within 2 weeks from today.

…contd.2

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
29.01.2026

A.No. 654/14

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Suresh Sisodia and Sh. Sushant Dogra, Ld.counsels for the appellant along with appellant in person.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Nareh Kumar Beniwal, Vansh Aggarwal and Sh. Jishnu Adhikari, Ld. counsels for the respondents no. 4, 5 and 6.

Arguments heard at length.
Put up for orders on **30.01.2026** at 4.00 pm.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 155/16 & 980/16

29.01.2026

Present : Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Dalip Rastogi is not available today due to ill-health.

The appeals pertain to the year 2016. In the interest of justice one more opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter.

Put up for arguments on **23.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 615/16, 636/16, 721/16 & 334/17

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Pramod Kumar, Husband of the appellant in person in appeal no. 615/16 & 636/16.
None for the appellant in appeal no. 721/16 & 334/17
Sh. Parmesh Bali, Ld counsel for the respondent.

It is stated by the husband of appellant Radha Gupta that she has passed away on 29.09.2025 in a road accident and some time is needed to implead her legal heirs and counsel, who is same in all the aforesaid four appeals, today is not available being held up before the Hon'ble High Court.

Infacts, put up for further proceedings in these two appeals bearing no. 615/16 & 636/16 and arguments in other two appeals 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
29.01.2026

A.No. 632/16

29.01.2026

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

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

The appeal pertain to the year 2016. 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 **29.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 162/17, 355/23 & 765/23

29.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 162/17.
Sh. S. Adlil Hussain, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 355/23 through VC.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal on 765/23

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
29.01.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 162/17.
Sh. S. Adlil Hussain, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 355/23 through VC.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal on 765/23

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 03.11.2025 as well.

Contd…2.

It is 2.15 PM. It appears that appellant is not interest in pursuing these appeal. The aforesaid appeals are 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
29.01.2026

A.No. 276/17

Promila Gupta Vs MCD
29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Anurag Malik, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Prithish Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.
Sh. M.N. Siddiqui, Ld. counsel for the respondent No.2 through VC.

1. Arguments heard at length.
2. This is an appeal seeking revocation of sanction of building plan granted in favour of respondent No.2 by MCD dated 09.04.2014 in respect of property No.38, Anandlok New Delhi.
3. The appellant who is sister of respondent No.2 has challenged this sanction on the ground that the consent of the appellant who is a co-owner was not obtained by respondent No.2 prior to applying for sanction. The No Objection Certification from the co-owner is essential. The construction has been raised entirely against the sanction and further that the right of the passage of the appellant has been obstructed by this unauthorized construction.
4. Ld. counsel for respondent No.2 on the other hand argued that appellant is not co-owner of the property. No NOC is required from the appellant and otherwise also no NOC was required from the co-owner of the property. The construction has been raised as per

sanctioned plan and there is no ground in the appeal that the right of passage of the appellant has been obstructed.

5. Ld. counsel for respondent on the other hand submitted that the sanction has been accorded as per law and there are no merits in the appeal.
6. I have perused the record. The appellant has not filed even a single document to show that she is co-owner of the property. The appellant claims to be the owner of ground and first floor of the front portion but this claim is not supported by any material. The sanction has been obtained under simplified procedure by the appellant who is the owner of the property. The status report filed by the MCD dated 21.02.2018 records that respondent No.2 submitted building plan application alongwith conveyance deed dated 05.07.2021 executed by DDA in favour of respondent No.2. The previous sanctioned building plan issued by the DDA dated 01.11.1974 was also in favour of respondent No.2. Respondent No.2 also submitted the occupancy certificated dated 08.05.86 issued in her favour by the DDA. None of these documents show that appellant is a co-owner in the property.
7. Coming to the arguments of the appellant relating to construction contrary to the sanctioned building plan, there is no such report by respondent MCD that the construction has been raised contrary to the

sanctioned building plan. Further there is no averment in the appeal that any right of passage of the appellant has been obstructed who admittedly is not residing in the property and is settled in Washington DC USA.

8. In these facts the appeal is devoid of merits, same is dismissed.
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
29.01.2026

A.No. 134/19 & 135/19

29.01.2026

Present : Sh R.K. Pandey and Mohd. Anwar. , Ld counsel for the appellant along with son of the appellant.

None for the respondent/MCD.

Sh. Atul Verma, Ld counsel for the respondent no. 2 and 3.

Part arguments heard.

Ld. counsel for respondent no.3 has filed certain documents. Copy supplied to Ld. counsel for respondent No.2 & 3 in the court today itself.

Ld. counsel for appellant seeks time to go through the documents.

At request of Ld. counsel for appellant, put up for further arguments on **30.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 200/21

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Amit Rathore, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Ms. Vasu Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent with Sh. Subodh Hatwal, AE(B).

At request, 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
29.01.2026

A.No. 67/22 & 68/22

29.01.2026

Present : Sh.Arshia Kohli , Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC with appellant present in the Court.

Sh. Ravi Ranjan , Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC.

Sh. R.K. Pandey, Ld counsel for applicant/intervener with applicant in person.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Sanjay Diwan is un-available today due marriage of his son.

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

Put up for arguments on **23.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 103/23

29.01.2026

Present : Ms. Seema Seth and Sh. Saurav Kumar, Ld counsels for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Ajay Gaur, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Ms. Renu Kuhar and Ms. Anshi Srivastava, Ld. counsels for the intervener.

Part arguments heard on application seeking condonation of delay and appeal.
At request, put up for further arguments on **16.03.2026**.
Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 153/23

29.01.2026

Present : Ms. Chitrakshi, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought by the ld. counsel for the appellant on the ground that she has no instruction from the appellant.

Perusal of the record shows that similar request was made on the last date of hearing.

Appellant is enjoying the interim protection since 29.03.2023. However, in the interest of justice, subject to cost of Rs. 5,000/- to be deposited with the Registry of this Tribunal, one last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address arguments on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **15.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 172/23

29.01.2026

Present : 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 Sh. Dalip Rastogi 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 **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
29.01.2026

A.No. 214/23 & 215/23

29.01.2026

Present : Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Kanwal chaudhary, Ld counsel for the intervener.

Ld. counsel for the intervener has filed an application seeking modification/vacation of the order dated 02.05.2023. Copy supplied.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Dalip Rastogi is not 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 application as well as appeal 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
29.01.2026

A.No. 323/23

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Kartik Sharma, Sh. Aryan Shah, Ms. Vanshika Mathuria and Ms. Sapna Rai, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Ms. Jasleen Kaur, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as the counsels have recently been engaged.

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 **03.06.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 459/23 & 460/23

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Sanjay Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

Part arguments heard.
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
29.01.2026

A.No. 662/23
Ziaul Ahmed vs. MCD

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Rambir Chauhan, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Ajay Gaur , Ld counsel for the respondent.

Appellant, who is accompanied by his counsel, submits that he wants to withdraw the aforesaid appeal as the demolition order dated 26.06.2023 does not belong to his property and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

Statement of appellant recorded separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by the appellant himself, 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
29.01.2026

A.No. 81/24

29.01.2026

Present : Appellant in person.
Sh. Mohit Sharma Ld counsel for the respondent.

Appellant seeks pass over on the ground that her counsel will come at 2.00 pm.

In view of the heavy cause list, pass-over in the matter is not possible and hence, it is adjourned.

Put up for arguments on **14.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 291/24 & 323/24

29.01.2026

Present : Ms. Parul, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Kamal Kishore, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

Fresh vakalatnama along with photographs filed on behalf of the intervener. Copy supplied. These documents are taken on record subject to any restrictions imposed by the Hon'ble High Court for taking the documents of the intervener on record.

At request made by the proxy counsel for the appellant, 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
29.01.2026

A.No. 485/24 & 486/24

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Kunal Mittal, Ld counsel for the appellant along with AR for the appellant.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

At request, put up for arguments on **03.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 1077/24

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Fanish K Jain and Sh. Abhishek Shokeen, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Vasu Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent No.1 alongwith Sh. Anurag, AE(B) joined through VC.
Sh. R.K. Singla, Ld. counsel for respondent No.
Sh. Rohit Kumar Modi, Ld. counsel for the society joined through VC.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Arguments heard. It is claimed by Ld. counsel for the appellant on the basis of the letter dated 20.04.2023 signed by Mr. Abhishek Mukhija, Zonal Manager, TPDDL that High Tension and Low tension TPDDL Lines are existing in the society and any digging near to these TPDDL cables and network may damage the live cables.

In facts, let notice be issued to TPDDL with the directions to verify and inform whether there exist live cables under the place where the proposed lift in front of flats No.109 - 111 and what is the nature of those lines and if the same can be shifted. Copy of this order alongwith letter dated 20.04.2023 be sent to the said Zonal Manager with direction to file report after physical inspection.

Put up for further arguments on appeal on **27.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
29.01.2026

A.No. 325/25

29.01.2026

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

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Dalip Rastogi is not 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 **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
29.01.2026

A.No. 650/25

Kulwant Singh Vs MCD

29.01.2026

Present : Sh. Pankaj Chawla, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that this court may pass order in accordance with law relating to jurisdiction of this Court in respect of sealing done as per directions of the Monitoring Committee.

Record perused. Admittedly the sealing action in the present case was done in pursuance to the letter dated 14.11.2024 issued by Hon'ble Monitoring Committee. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide its order dated 13.09.2022 and 28.01.2019 passed in W.P.(C) 4677/85 has held that the jurisdiction in respect of sealing order passed by the Hon'ble Monitoring Committee shall lie with the Judicial Committee and not before any other Court.

In view of the same, this Tribunal does have jurisdiction to entertain this appeal. The same is dismissed. The appellant shall be at liberty to approach appropriate forum for challenging the impugned order.

Contd..2.

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
29.01.2026

A.No. 239/24 & 240/24

29.01.2026

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

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
29.01.2026