

A.No. 126/26

18.02.2026

Fresh Appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. B.S. Mathur, 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 with connected appeal on **28.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 129/26

18.02.2026

Fresh Appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. G.D. Mishra, 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 on **24.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 130/26

18.02.2026

Fresh Appeal received. It be checked and registered.

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 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 **29.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 131/26

18.02.2026

Fresh Appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. U.M. Tripathi , 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 **03.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 132/26

18.02.2026

Fresh Appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Devraj, 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 **27.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 133/26

18.02.2026

Fresh Appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Zafar Abbas and Ms. Nusrat Jahan, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

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

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

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **20.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 134/26

18.02.2026

Fresh Appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Satyendra Chahar, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The appellant has challenged the permission for installation of lift dated 15.12.2025 accorded to Smt. Binu Sharma and Sunita Kataria. They have not been made party to this case. They are necessary party since the permission is in their name and any order passed by this court shall have bearing on their right of installing the lift.

The appellant is directed to make them party to this appeal.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks some time to do the needful.

At request, put up for further proceedings on **27.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 132/23 & 133/23

18.02.2026

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

Files are taken up today on applications of early hearing filed on behalf of the appellant.

Let notice of these applications be issued to the respondent for **13.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 517/25

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Sarthak Ahuja, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The present appeal is only against the impugned sealing order dated 23.06.2025. As far as the prayer clause (C) seeking quashing of show cause notice dated 08.07.2025 is concerned, the same itself is not maintainable as show cause notice cannot be challenged.

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 **11.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 687/25

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Rinku Yadav, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

None has appeared for the respondent despite service.
VC of the court is not working today.

Put up for filing of status report and record as well as 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
18.02.2026

At this stage, Sh. Sagar Kumar, Ld. counsel for the respondent has
appeared through VC. He is apprised about the today's order.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 110/26

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Prasama and Sh. Kanav Gupta, Ld counsels for the appellant.

Sh. Anupam Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

Sh. Manish Yadav, Nodal Officer for DDA.

Ld. counsel for the DDA seeks time to file reply and further, it is stated that this appeal is not maintainable as the impugned order is not appealable under Section 31(C) of the DDA Act.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to make submissions on the aspect of maintainability of this appeal.

At request, put up for arguments on **08.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 1222/15

18.02.2026

Present : Ms. Preeti Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

None for the respondent.

VC of the court is not working today.

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further arguments 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
18.02.2026

A.No. 791/16

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellants.
Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld. counsel for the respondent
through VC.
Sh. Mukesh Sachdeva, Ld. counsel for the intervener
along with intervener in person.

At request, put up for arguments on **19.03.2026** along
with appeal no. 809/16.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 792/16

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellants.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Mukesh Sachdeva, Ld. counsel for the intervener
along with intervener.

Vide order dated 21.05.2024, the respondent was directed to produce the entire house-tax record of Flat no. 136, Suraksha Enclave, Pitam Pura, Delhi, but that order still remains to be complied.

Let the entire property tax record of this flat be filed on or before the next date of hearing.

At request, put up for 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
18.02.2026

A.No. 793/16

Suneel Mahajan Vs. MCD

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellants.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld. counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Mukesh Sachdeva, Ld. counsel for the intervener
along with intervener.

1. Arguments heard at length.
2. The appeal was filed on 22.08.2016 against the demolition order dated 04.02.2008 with the delay of about 8 years. Appeal is pending since 2016. Service of show cause notice and demolition order is in dispute. As per appellant he came to know about the demolition order only when the notice dated 28.07.2016 u/c 435 of DMC Act was served. In these facts, the delay is in condoned with an endeavour to decide the appeals on merits.
3. This is an appeal challenging the demolition order dated 04.02.2008 passed in respect of unauthorized construction in form of a room in the backside at first floor and one room and bathroom at second floor of flat no. 134, Surakhsha Enclave, Pitam pura, Delhi.
4. The brief facts necessary for disposal of this appeal are that the said unauthorized construction was booked vide show cause notice dated 29.01.2008

Contd.....2/-

:: 2 ::

being a Monitoring Committee case recorded that the construction is old and occupied. The appellant gave reply to the show cause notice on 01.02.2008 stating that the society has taken up the matter for construction of unutilized FAR with Superintending Engineer (Building), Town Hall, MCD and till then no demolition order has been taken. Pursuant there to the impugned order was passed recording that the reply received is not satisfactory and unauthorized construction against BBL cannot be regularized.

5. The order has been challenged on several grounds including the protection available under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. Ld counsel for the appellant stated that as per property tax return of 2006-2007, the appellant has mentioned the covered area at first and second floor of 68.97 sq. meter and additional area 8.66 sq. meter on the first floor i.e. total covered area of 77.63 sq. meter which shows that additional construction other than the total area of the allotted flat of 53.52 sq. meter was constructed much prior to 08.02.2007 and therefore same is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. It was also argued that the booking dated

Contd... 3/-

:: 3 ::

29.01.2008 itself record that the construction is old and occupied and the burden was on the respondent to show that it was raised after 08.02.2007 and before 29.01.2008 and therefore the impugned demolition order should be set-aside.

6. Ld counsel for the respondent/MCD and the intervener argued that admittedly the construction is unauthorized and therefore cannot be protected. The appellant has not produced any document reflecting that the construction is authorized or old and occupied and therefore the appeal should be dismissed.
7. I have perused the record. The appellant through PTR for the year 2006-2007 has established that extra covered area on the first and second floor of the subject flat existed prior to 08.02.2007. Undisputedly the covered area of the flat at the time of allotment was 53.52 sq. meter and the additional construction was raised prior to 08.02.2007. The same is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.
8. In these facts, the impugned demolition order dated 04.02.2008 is upheld but, the impugned order is kept in abeyance in respect of property of the appellant till

Contd....4/-

:: 4 ::

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.

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
18.02.2026

A.No. 809/16

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellants.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent
Sh. Mukesh Sachdeva, Ld. counsel for the intervener
along with intervener.
Part arguments heard.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has placed on record copy of a house-tax receipt for the year 2006-07 of Rs. 1737/- in respect of flat no. 146, Suraksha Enclave, Delhi. Copy supplied.

The House Tax record has already been filed by the respondent and as per the status report dated 22.12.2016, no additional area has been assessed by A&C Department of the MCD.

Respondent MCD is directed to calculate the area for which this tax of Rs. 1737/- was deposited as per the rate prevailing in the year 2006-07 for Suraksha Enclave, Delhi.

Let the same be verified and the report be filed along with calculation on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further 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
18.02.2026

A.No. 42/17

Sanjeev Singhal Vs. MCD

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellants.
Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld. counsel for the respondent through VC.
Sh. Mukesh Sachdeva, Ld. counsel for the intervener along with intervener.

1. Arguments heard at length.
2. The appeal was filed on 24.01.2017 against the demolition order dated 08.12.2017 with the delay of about 40 days. Appeal is pending since 2017. Service of show cause notice and demolition order is in dispute. In these facts, the delay is in condoned with an endeavour to decide the appeals on merits.
3. This is an appeal challenging the demolition order dated 08.12.2016 passed in respect of unauthorized construction in the shape of one room in the backside at ground floor of flat no. 113, Suraksha enclave, Pitam Pura, Delhi.
4. The brief facts necessary for disposal of this appeal are that the said unauthorized construction was booked vide show cause notice dated 29.11.2016 on PGC complaint on inspection dated 31.10.2016

Contd.....2/-

:: 2 ::

recorded that the construction is old and occupied. Since no reply was received, the impugned order was passed recording that no reply has been received.

5. The order has been challenged on several grounds including the protection available under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. Ld counsel for the appellant stated that neither the show cause notice was served nor the demolition order and the impugned is liable to be set-aside on this ground alone. It was stated that at page no. 1/N of the office record it is mentioned that all the flat is old and residentially occupied and at page 2/N it was mentioned that age of construction is not identified yet the property was booked on false complaint. It was argued that when the respondent MCD itself is not sure about the date of alleged construction and itself mentioned in the show cause notice that it is old and occupied, then there are no grounds to book the property and the property was booked arbitrarily without verifying as to when the construction was raised. It was argued that as per status report dated 04.12.2024, the respondent claimed that requisite information of the subject property is not available but

Contd...3/-

:: 3 ::

the property tax receipt filed by the appellant dated 14.06.2008 of an amount of Rs.1571/- was not considered.

6. Ld counsel for the respondent/MCD and the intervener argued that admittedly the construction is unauthorized and therefore cannot be protected. The appellant has not produced any document reflecting that the construction is authorized or old and occupied and therefore the appeal should be dismissed.
7. I have perused the record. The present booking was done only on the basis of PGC complaint. The respondent/MCD in the office record dated 24.11.2016 available at page 1/N of the record has mentioned that the subject property is old and residentially occupied and further on page 2/N recorded that the age of construction is not identified. The respondent was required to tell as to when this unauthorized construction was raised. The appellant has filed the house tax record which shows that property tax of Rs.1571/- without any arrears was deposited for the year 2008-2009. This receipt is available even in the office record produced by the respondent. Admittedly, in the year 2008-2009 the property tax were filed on the basis of covered area and not on the basis of cost of land and cost of

Contd...4/-

:: 4 ::

construction. The respondent failed to produced this PTR of 2008-2009 despite producing the receipt of Rs.1571/-. The appellant has shown through MCD record itself that the construction is old and occupied and the present booking was made only on the basis of PGC complaint when no fresh construction was ongoing in the property.

8. The construction is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.
9. In these facts, the impugned demolition order dated 08.12.2016 is upheld but the impugned order is kept in abeyance in respect of property of the appellant till this Act is in force. The respondent is at liberty to take action once the Act ceases to be in force. Appeal stands disposed of.
10. 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
18.02.2026

A.No. 305/17 & 306/17

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellants.
Ms. Kritika, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. V.K. Aggarwal,
counsel the respondent in appeal no. 305/17.
Sh. Dharmvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 306/17.
Sh. Mukesh Sachdeva, Ld. counsel for the intervener Sh.
Rajesh Sethi along with intervener.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has filed an application
under Order XXII rule 3 CPC read with XXII rule 9 CPC
along with application u/s 5 of Limitation Act and copy of
the death certificate and power of attorney. Copy
supplied.

Let the reply to this application, if any, be filed with
advance copy to the opposite side.

At request, put up for arguments on these application 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
18.02.2026

A.No. 307/17

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellants.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent
Sh. Mukesh Sachdeva, Ld. counsel for the intervener
along with intervener.

At request, put up for arguments on **19.03.2026** with
other connected matters.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 950/16
Pinki Aggarwal Vs. MCD

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. A.K. Vashisht, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld. counsel for the respondent.
Intervener in person.

Arguments heard. Record perused.

The service of show cause notice and demolition order are being disputed by the appellant.

Record shows that show cause notice dated 08.07.2015 is reported to be served through pasting on 10.07.2015, whereas the demolition order dated 16.07.2015 was sent by speed-post on 17.07.2015 and was pasted on the same day itself.

Record also shows that the part demolition action was taken on the first and third floor of the property on 16.07.2015 itself i.e. same date, on which this order was passed. The demolition order was not served in time and even as per the service proof filed on record, the same was sent only on 17.07.2015. This clearly established that principles of natural justice were violated as the demolition action was taken even without service of the demolition order on the appellant, which itself mentions that the alleged unauthorized construction be demolished by the owner/occupier within 6 days from 16.07.2015.

....contd.2

: 2 :

In these facts, the impugned demolition order is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply/documents to be submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 10.03.2026 at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed after hearing the appellant and after considering the reply and documents filed by the appellant, within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

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
18.02.2026

A.No. 342/17

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. R.K.
Kashyap, counsel for the respondent.

Status report filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Invalid notice was issued yesterday only. Copy supplied.

The respondent had asked the appellant to give complete ownership documents demanded at serial no. 2 of this Invalid notice.

This court vide order dated 02.12.2025 passed in appeal no. 748/24 has already stated that the documents filed by the appellant along with indemnity bond are sufficient to consider the ownership of the property, yet the respondent has again insisted on complete ownership documents. **Let the AE(B) concerned be present in the court for explanation on the next date of hearing.**

Further, this Invalid notice seeking 11 compliances has given only 7 days time to the appellant. The respondent after 02.12.2025 slept over for almost 2-1/2 months and this Invalid notice was issued yesterday only to inform this Court that Invalid notice has been issued and given insufficient time to the appellant to comply with this notice.

...contd.2

: 2 :

The appellant is given 4 weeks time from today to comply with other requirements of this Invalid notice.

Put up for arguments on **24.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 590/22, 591/22 & 592/22

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. G.D. Mishra, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
None for the respondent

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

It was stated by Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, counsel for the respondent on the last date of hearing that these cases have not been marked to him officially.

Let notice of this appeal be issued to the CLO, MCD for engagement of a counsel in the aforesaid matters for the next date of hearing.

The Executive Engineer (B) is directed to ensure the presence of the concerned AE(B) on next date of hearing.

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
18.02.2026

A.No. 396/23
Imran Vs. MCD

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Harish Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant alongwith
appellant.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent

1. Arguments heard.
2. This is an appeal against the demolition order dated 27.02.2023 passed in respect of unauthorized construction in the shape of ground, first, second, third and fourth floor of the property No.5108, Gali Qudratullah, near Masjid Ghante Wali, Sadar Nala Road, Sadar Bazar, Delhi-110006.
3. As per appellant he made only repair and renovation in the property but one neighbor Zahid raised objection to the said work and raised a demand from the appellant which was not filled and therefore, the property was booked unlawfully which is old and occupied and protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.
4. Ld. counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that service of show cause notice and demolition order is not disputed. The appellant

Contd....2/-

:: 2 ::

purchased the property on 20.05.2022 constructed only up to second floor. As on date the property is existing up to fourth floor even as per the affidavit of the appellant which must have been raised after purchasing the same in May, 2022. There is no sanctioned building plan nor the protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 is available as fresh construction was raised after 08.02.2007 and therefore appeal has no merits.

5. I have perused the record. Mohd. Zahid the said neighbor of the appellant filed W.P.(C) No.1040/2023 before Hon'ble High Court claiming unauthorized construction by the appellant in the subject property. MCD filed status report before the Hon'ble High Court mentioning that upon field inspection it was found that unauthorized construction has been carried out in the subject property and demolition order has already been passed. The appellant was given liberty to approach this Tribunal.
6. The office record shows that the show cause notice dated 23.01.2023 was duly received by the appellant himself under his signatures. Thereafter, he did not give any reply to the notice and the demolition order dated 27.02.2023 was passed which was duly

Contd....3/-

:: 3 ::

received by the appellant on 10.03.2023 under his signatures. The service of show cause notice and the impugned order therefore, is undisputed.

7. Coming to the merits of the case, there is no sanctioned building plan of the subject property. The appellant has sought protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. As per the ownership documents filed by the appellant, he purchased the subject property on 20.05.2022 which was much after 08.02.2007 which is the cutoff date for protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. When the appellant purchased this property it was constructed only up to second floor. As per the site plan and an affidavit of exiting construction on the date of appeal, the property now comprises of ground, first, second, third and fourth floor. The construction above second floor admittedly has been raised after it was purchased on 20.05.2022. The appellant not only violated the status quo order but also is not entitled to protection available under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. Not even a single document has been filed to show that the construction existing in the property

Contd...4/-

:: 4 ::

as on today was existed prior to 08.02.2007. The appeal is therefore devoid of merits, same is dismissed. The demolition order dated 27.02.2023 is upheld.

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
18.02.2026

A.No. 384/23

18.02.2026

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

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further arguments on **27.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 559/23
M/s Mahamai Builder Pvt. Ltd. Vs.MCD

18.02.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, 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/18.2.26

At 3.12 pm

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, 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
27.10.2025 as well.

It is already 3.12 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 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
18.02.2026

A.No. 488/24 & 2/25

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. B.S. Mathur, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta for the respondent in appeal no. 2/25.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 488/24 through VC.

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

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 **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
18.02.2026

A.No. 932/24 & 933/24

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. R.K. Mittal, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh
Gupta for the respondent in appeal no.
Sh. Pulkit Arora, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

An application seeking vacation of stay is filed by the Intervener. The intervener has no right to file any such application. Same is dismissed.

Arguments heard on both the appeals.

The respondent is directed to produce the entire property tax record of property no. 19-E and 19-F, MIG Flats, Vatika Apartments, Rajouri Garden, Delhi, on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further arguments on **14.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 277/25

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Rajeev Lochan Mahunta, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the appellant on the ground that he has no instruction for today.

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

Put up for arguments on **27.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 413/25

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Akshaya Aggarwal, Id. counsel for the appellant through VC.

Sh. Shivang Srivastava and Sh. Rishi Rai, Ld counsels for the appellant.

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

Part arguments heard.

At request made by Id. counsel for the appellant, 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
18.02.2026

A.No. 533/25

18.02.2026

Present : Sh. Areeb Amanullah, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the respondent has confirmed that the misuser charges have been deposited by the appellant. In view of the same, without prejudice to the rights of the parties on merits of the case, **let the property be desealed within two weeks from today** subject to outcome of this appeal.

The appellant shall furnish an undertaking to the respondent that the same shall not be used for any purpose other than those permissible under MPD-2021 and the appellant shall not create any third party interest in the property till disposal of this appeal without prior permission of this Tribunal.

Put up for compliance and further arguments on **30.07.2026.**

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 732/25

18.02.2026

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

Part arguments heard.

At request made by ld. counsel for the appellant, put up
for further arguments on **27.02.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
18.02.2026

A.No. 62/20 & 63/20

18.02.2026

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

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present appeal is 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
18.02.2026