

A.No. 125/26

17.02.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Manoj 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 **23.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 128/26

17.02.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Rajnish Ranjan, 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 **30.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the ground floor right side portion of property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 19.06.2025. 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
17.02.2026

A.No. 363/25

17.02.2026

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

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. M.K. Sharma has been suffering from cough and cold and is not in a position to appear today.

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 **17.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 659/25 & 660/25

17.02.2026

Present : Appellant in person.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. S.C Mishra, JLO and Sh. Faiz Ahmad, AE(B).

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

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

Some time is sought to produce the demolition record as the file is not traceable today.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Dalip Rastogi is held up in Patiala House Court.

At request made by the appellant, 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
17.02.2026

A.No. 663/25

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Sachin Bandooni, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Krishna Kant Tiwari, Ld. counsel for the appellant in person.

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

Issue notice of this application to the respondent for **13.03.2026.**

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 685/25

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Sidhant Jain and Sh. Keshav Ray, Ld. counsels for the appellant through VC
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.'

Status report is filed by the MCD. Copy be supplied.

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

Arguments on the application under Order VI rule 17 CPC heard.

By way of this application, the appellant wants to challenge the demolition order dated 08.04.2024 and the details of the same were not mentioned in the prayer though it was prayed that coercive action including demolition of the property need not to be taken. Since, the mistake seems to be a lacuna on the part of the counsel, the application is allowed and the appellant is permitted to challenge the demolition order dated 08.04.2024. Amended appeal is taken on record.

The record produced by the respondent shows that the property was initially booked for unauthorized construction at ground floor and walls and columns on the first floor on 01.08.2022 and followed by a demolition order dated 16.08.2022 and partial demolition action was

...contd.2

: 2 :

taken on 13.09.2022. The appellant also submitted his reply dated 18.08.2022 to this show cause notice admitting construction and also sought permission to reconstruct it. Subsequently, the property was again booked on 21.03.2024 for further construction in the shape of first floor in continuation of previous booking. The appellant till date has not challenge the first booking and demolition order and the property is without any sanctioned building plan situated in Raj Nagar-II, Palam Colony, Delhi.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to move application to get the property regularized. Let the same be done, failing which, 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
17.02.2026

A.No. 696/25

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Sh. Burhan Zaki and Mohd. Asim, Ld.
counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Id. Counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The record has already been submitted.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **22.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 812/25

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Rahul Yadav, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Sh. Ajay Gaur, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Sarita Gaur, ALO and Sh. Hem Dutt Bhardwaj, AE(B). Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

The appellant, who is accompanied by a counsel, submits that he wants to withdraw the aforesaid appeal and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

Statement of the appellant recorded separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by 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
17.02.2026

A.No. 13/26 (M)
Sandeep Jain Vs. MCD

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. A.K. Nigam , Ld counsel for the appellant/applicant.

File is taken up today on an application seeking review of the order dated 13.01.2026.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that he does not want to press this application.

In view of the submissions made by the ld. counsel for the appellant/applicant, the aforesaid application stands dismissed as not pressed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 124/26

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, 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 **05.05.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order No. DA04(82)2026/LM/NZ/98 dated 10.02.2026. 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
17.02.2026

A.No. 605/16

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Ram Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant along with
appellant in person.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to file the complete video recording of the marriage ceremony of his son to show that the CD placed on record is not doctored. Let he be to do so.

At request, put up for further arguments on **06.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 200/18 & 226/18
Dr. Rohit Mahindra Vs. MCD

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Amit Sethi along with Sh. B. Anand and Neeraj Kargeti, Ld counsels for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

1. Arguments heard at length.
2. These are two appeals challenging the demolition order dated 08.03.2018 and the rejection of regularization application order dated 07.03.2018 passed in respect of second floor at back-side portion of property no. 46, Banglow Road, Kamla Nagar, Delhi-110007.
3. The brief facts necessary disposal of these two appeals are that the respondent booked the unauthorized construction in the shape of entire second floor at back-side portion of the subject property on 03.05.2017 and the show cause notice was issued to the appellant. Since, the reply filed was not found satisfactory, a demolition order dated 11.05.2017 was passed in respect of this unauthorized construction. The appellant challenged this demolition order in appeal no. 784/17 and this

Contd...2/-

:: 2 ::

Tribunal vide order 30.07.2017 remanded the matter back with directions to the respondent to pass speaking order and preferably within one month after conclusion of the hearing. The respondent thereafter gave opportunity of being heard to the appellant and passed the impugned demolition order dated 08.03.2018 and also rejected the regularization application of the said unauthorized construction on 07.03.2018. Both these orders have been assailed in these appeals.

4. Ld counsel for the appellant argued that the application of regularization of this construction of the left-side of annexe building was wrongly rejected without considering the fact that this construction has been raised on the old construction existing at ground and first floor of the annexe building and against which no action has been taken. It was argued that floor-wise regularization is now permissible and the respondent should have considered this aspect. The grounds on which the regularization application has been rejected were never mentioned in the show cause notice and no opportunity to address this objection was provided to the appellant. The building-bye laws 1959 and 1983 permits construction of

Contd...3/-

:: 3 ::

garage in the property and the regularization application of the appellant should have been considered on the basis of these two building-byelaws. It was argued that this court directed the respondent vide order dated 30.08.2017 to decide the matter within a month but same was not so done and this alone is a good ground to set-aside the impugned orders. Ld counsel for the appellant in support of his submissions relied upon following judgments.

(i). R. Satyanarayana Vs. Shantha (Smt.) & Ors. (1999) 5 Supreme Court Cases 704.

(ii). M/s DCM Ltd. Vs. Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors. C.W.P. No. 3807 of 1997, Dated 03.04.1998.

(iii). M. Saraswathi Vs. The Principal Secretary & Anr. W.P. No. 17931 of 2014.

5. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that as on date UBBL-2016 shall apply for regularization of this construction which admittedly was made in March, 2014. The building-byelaws which are applicable on the date of application of regularization are to be considered. As per MPD-2021 under clause 4.4.3, a minimum set-back of 6 meter in front and 3 meter in rear and 3 meter each on the two sides is required for a property having size

Contd...4/-

:: 4 ::

between 500 to 2000 sq. meter. The subject property is around 1200 sq. meter and without leaving this minimum in rear, the construction on the second floor of the annexe building cannot be regularized. It was argued that even the protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 is not available.

6. I have perused the record. The appellant himself has claimed in para 3 of the appeal that after becoming owner of the second floor in main building and entire left-side portion of annexe building, the appellant raised construction on the second floor of the annexe building. It means that the protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 is not available as the construction prior to 08.02.2007 only is protected at this location. Further, the plan approved by Hon'ble High Court in the partition suit by which the appellant became the owner show that as on 17.02.2014 there was no construction on the second floor of the annexe building and this construction has been raised unauthorizedly without any sanction building plan. The appellant sought regularization only after raising construction and thus violated the law.

Contd...5/-

:: 5 ::

7. The regularization application was rejected on 07.03.2018 for the reason that the construction made in the rear set-back is non-compoundable. MPD-2021 clause 4.4.3 applicable on the date of regularization application clearly provides that a mandatory set-back of 3 meter is required to be left in the rear side in the subject property. The contention of the appellant that earlier building-bye laws under which the annexe building was construction upto first floor shall apply is meritless arguments. If the construction was raised after partition around March, 2014 and regularization is sought subsequently, the prevailing building bye laws and provision of MPD-2021 shall apply and not of 1959 or 1983.
8. The other argument of the appellant that the show cause notice was completely silent in this regard is also baseless since the show cause notice clearly records unauthorized construction on the second floor on the back-side of the property and the same was also reflected in simplified drawing made on the show cause notice. There is no ambiguity about the identification of the unauthorized construction. The appellant was well aware that what unauthorized construction has been mentioned in the show cause

Contd... 6/-

notice and therefore applied for regularization of the same.

9. Coming to the aspect of the delay in passing the two orders. The order 30.08.2017 stated that the matter be decided afresh preferably within one month of conclusion of fresh hearing. The respondent concluded those hearings on 22.012.2017 and thereafter these two orders were passed. Though there is delay in passing the orders but the same did not cause any prejudice to the appellant. The facts of the judgment of Hon'ble Madras High Court passed in the case M. Saraswathy (Supra) a totally different. In that case directions were given to conclude the disciplinary proceedings within outer limit of 3 months and extended limit of 2 months. The Hon'ble High Court was of the opinion that a delay in concluding the disciplinary proceedings is fatal to the interest of the petitioner therein. The present case the delay in passing the order has not caused any prejudice to the appellant more so when the directions was to pass order preferably within one month after conclusion of the hearing. In these facts, both the appeals are devoid of merits.

Contd... 7/-

:: 7 ::

10. The unauthorized construction in the annexe building on second floor cannot be regularized. The same is not protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.
11. The appeals are dismissed.
12. 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
17.02.2026

A.No. 303/20 & 151/24

17.02.2026

Present : Appellant in person.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal and Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsels
for the respondent in appeal no. 303/20.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 151/24.

Status report is filed by the MCD in compliance to the
order dated 24.05.2024. Copy supplied.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as
his counsel Sh. Dalip Rastogi, is held up before Patiala
House Court. In the interest of justice one more
opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the
arguments in the matter on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **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
17.02.2026

A.No. 316/24 & 317/24

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Prateek Choudhary and Sh. B.S. Bhartwal, Ld
counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent
through VC in appeal no. 316/24.
Sh. Sagar Dhama, Ld. counsel for the respondent
through VC in appeal no. 317/24.

Part arguments heard at length.

Put up for further arguments on **01.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 344/24 & 388/24

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld. counsel for the appellant along with Appellant in person.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 344/24.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Id. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 388/24 along with Sh. Arvind Choudhary, AE(B), HQ.
Sh. Krishan Bansal, respondent no. 8 in person and is also appearing for respondent no. 9 his wife.
Dr. Sarabjit Sharma, Ld. counsel for the respondents No.8 and 9 in appeal No.344/24.
Dr. Sarabjit Sharma, Ld. counsel for the respondents No.2 and 3 in appeal No.388/24.
None for the respondent No.2 to 7 in appeal No.344/24.

Part arguments heard.

At request, 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
17.02.2026

A.No. 441/24, 473/24 & 600/24

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. K.N. Singh and Sh. Prabhnoor Singh, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal No.473/24.
None for the respondent in appeal Nos. 441/24 & 600/24
Ms. Anita Dev, Ld. counsel for intervener.

Part arguments heard.

It is the case of the respondent that the unauthorized construction consisting of basement and other floors in the property whereas as per appellant there is no basement in the property and construction has been raised as per sanctioned building plan.

At present, the property is lying sealed. Let the same be desealed and inspected with the directions to take the photographs and videography to show whether there exists any basement in the property or not.

Let the property be desealed for the inspection on 23.02.2026 at 2.00 p.m. and resealed the same after inspection and the status report, photographs and videography be filed on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further arguments on **16.03.2026**.

....contd.2

: 2 :

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

Copy of the order be given dasti.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 1/25

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Bhoopender Kumar and Sh Santoshi Yadav, Ld proxy
counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as arguing counsel Ms. Suruchi Aggarwal has left for Hon'ble High Court because of some urgent mentioning. Same is strongly opposed as the appellant has been seeking adjournment on the ground of non-availability of the counsel since obtaining interim protection on 07.01.2025.

Record shows that after 07.01.2025 adjournment was sought on behalf of the appellant on the ground non-availability of the counsel on 26.05.2025 as well as on 29.10.2025 and on the same ground today as well.

Ld. counsel for the respondent has submitted that interim orders may be vacated. However, in facts request for adjournment is allowed without vacating the interim order subject to the cost of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited with the Registry of this Tribunal. It is made clear that no further opportunity shall be granted in the matter.

Put up for arguments on **15.04.2026**.

Contd.....2/-

:: 2 ::

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 39/25

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Himanshu Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Anupam Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC along with Sh. Manish Yadav, Nodal Officer in person.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has placed on record the certified copy of the Conveyance Deed and it is stated that since the appellant is out of India, the original deed could not be produced.

Let counsel for the DDA submits that let the appellant appear before the concerned Officer namely Sh. Saurabh Mehta, Dy. Director, Lease Administration Branch, Room No. 307, Block C-2, Vikas Sadan, INA, New Delhi.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to take instructions as to when the appellant will be in India to appear before the concerned officer. Let it be done.

At request, 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
17.02.2026

A.No. 149/25

17.02.2026

Present : Ms. Disha Khurana, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks adjournment to file the House-tax record which the appellant is trying to receive through RTI.

It has been informed that the ground floor owner has also preferred an appeal no. 127/25, which is now listed on 10.07.2026.

At request, put up this matter for arguments with that appeal on 10.07.2026.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 165/25

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Manoj Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Jasleen Kaur, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

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

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
17.02.2026

A.No. 179/25

17.02.2026

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

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

An adjournment is sought by the ld. counsel for the appellant as he wants to inspect the record.

At request, 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
17.02.2026

A.No. 368/25 & 369/25

17.02.2026

Present : Ms. Kirti Mewar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Sanjay Sethi, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. Deepak Tyagi, AE(B), Karol Bagh Zone.

Attested copy of the sanctioned building plan filed by the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that since the sanctioned building plan is not available with the appellant, let the copy be supplied by the respondent. Let the same be supplied to the appellant's counsel.

Respondent is directed to inspect the property in the presence of AR of the appellant and to file inspection report preferably with the photograph and videography to show the extent of the deviations/unauthorized construction if any existing in these two properties, for which let the property be desealed on 26.02.2026 at 11.00 am and after carrying out the inspection, same be resealed.

Detailed Inspection report be filed on or before the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **10.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 1136/13

17.02.2026

Present: Ms. Sana Ansari and Mr. I. Ahmed, Ld. counsels for the appellant.

Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the aforesaid appeal is dismissed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
17.02.2026

A.No. 209/24

Sunita Sondhi and Anr Vs MCD

17.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent
joined through VC.
None for the intervener.

1. Vide this order I will dispose of an application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC filed by the intervener seeking his impleadment as responded. The intervener is the occupier of a floor in the property and it is stated that it was on his complaint the property of the appellants was booked and therefore, he is an essential party to this appeal and should be impleaded as respondent. The intervener relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble High Court passed in the case of Meena Sharma Vs Seema Sharma in CM (M) 289/2017 dated 28.11.2019.
2. Ld. counsel for the appellant however stated that the facts of the case of Meena Sharma (Supra) are totally different and the intervener cannot be made a party in view of the judgment of Hon'ble High Court passed in the case of Hardayal Singh Vs MCD AIR 1990 Delhi 170.

Contd...2..

3. I have perused the record. The appellant filed W.P.(C) No.10712/2023 which was disposed of by the Hon'ble High Court on 17.08.2023 when the respondent MCD submitted that show cause notice has already been issued against the illegal construction. The intervener thereafter filed contempt case No.792/2024 which was disposed of on 04.09.2025 recording that the demolition order has already been passed but because of stay by this Tribunal no action could be taken. The Hon'ble High Court disposed of this petition with liberty to the intervener to approach Hon'ble High Court in case there is continued infraction.
4. Now coming to the facts of the case of Meena Sharma (Supra). In that case the Hon'ble High Court was pleased to note that while disposing of application seeking revival of contempt petition, the Hon'ble High Court vide order passed on 18.12.2015 noted that the petitioner therein is necessary and proper party. In view of that observations the Hon'ble High Court permitted the impleadment of Meena Sharma. Further it was noted that the regularization application of the respondent therein be disposed of within 15 days and petitioner be intimated in writing. This was

Contd...3..

also a reason for impleading Meena Sharma as respondent. The intervener admittedly is not an aggrieved person against the impugned demolition order as he is supporting that order and does not fall in the category of aggrieved person as defined in the case of **ANZ Grindlays Bank Vs The Commissioner MCD 1995 II AD Delhi 573**.

5. The facts herein are totally different. The Hon'ble High Court never observed that the intervener is necessary and proper party. The Hon'ble High Court never observed that the intervener shall be informed about the decision in writing. The intervener can assist this court through arguments and documents as permitted by the judgment passed in Hardayal Singh Mehta (Supra).
6. In view of the same this application is dismissed with liberty to the intervener to file document and argue the matter at the final stage. The application is disposed of.
7. Put up for arguments on appeal 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
17.02.2026