

A.No. 143/26

23.02.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. H.S. Sodhi, 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 **08.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 149/26

23.02.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Kush Sharma and Ms. Niharika Talwar, 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 **03.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 155/26

23.02.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. R.K. Lamba, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The appellant has not filed even a single document to show that the construction is old and protected nor there is any sanctioned building plan. No case for interim protection is made out at this stage.

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  
23.02.2026

A.No. 156/26, 157/26 & 158/26

23.02.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Rajnish Ranjan, Ld counsel for the appellants.

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 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  
23.02.2026

A.No. 160/26

23.02.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Kislaya Parashar, Sh. Sonu Gautaam and Sh. Ankit Kumar, Ld counsels 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 **24.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 01.04.2025. 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  
23.02.2026

A.No. 225/23 & 226/23

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. Anubhav Singhal, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

It is stated for the appellant that the cost dated 15.10.2025 has already been deposited and counsel has to seek instruction in respect of cost dated 20.03.2024.

Registry is directed to report about both these cost.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main arguing counsel is not available because of BCD election.

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 **14.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 630/25

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. Kishore Kunal and Sh. Rahul Tiwari, Ld counsels for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Ms. Sarita Gaur, ALO. Memo of appearance filed.  
Sh. Hemant Kakkar, Ld. counsel for the intervener along with intervener.

An application under Order I rule 10 CPC filed on behalf of the intervener. Let the copy be supplied to the other parties.

Be awaited for record of the MCD as well as arguments on the application under Order I rule 10 CPC as well as appeal on **25.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 697/25 & 698/25

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. HImanshu Sihag, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC along with Ms. Shweta, proxy counsel, who is present in the court.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

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

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

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  
23.02.2026

A.No. 839/25

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. Prem Chandra, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent along  
with Sh. Subodh Hathwal, AE(B), Shahdara South Zone.  
Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

It is stated that two connected appeals of the same  
properties are listed on 12.05.2026.

At request, put up for arguments on **12.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 884/25 & 885/25

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. Rishabh Jain, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant along with appellants.

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

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Record has already been submitted.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is held up in some other court.

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 **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  
23.02.2026

A.No. 78/26

**Manish Gupta Vs. MCD**

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. Sermon Rawat along with Sh. Vikas Rathi, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Ms. Sarita Gaur, ALO and Sh. K.K. Yadav, AE(B), Civil Line Zone.

1. Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.
2. Ld counsel for the appellant has filed certain photographs and copy of the complaint dated 21.04.2024 made to SHO, PS, Burari.
3. Arguments heard at length.
4. The appellant has challenged the demolition order dated 14.01.2026 passed in respect of unauthorized construction in the form of raising of boundary wall, erection of tin shed roof and a room (toilet) at ground floor of property bearing Khasra. No. 351 near Mittal Restaurant, 100 foota Road, Burari, Delhi.
5. As per appellant a show cause notice dated 10.12.2025 was duly replied on 25.12.2025 but the respondent did not consider the documents of the appellant which shows that there had been a pre-existing prior to 2006 boundary wall which was only

Contd....2/-

:: 2 ::

repaired, a room which dates prior to 2006 and that tin shed is a temporary nature and is for installing solar panel for which no building permission is required and therefore the impugned demolition order has been challenged.

6. It was argued for the appellant that this tin shed is not a building as defined under clause 1.4.15 of UBBL-2016. It is only a tin shed as defined u/s 2 (55) of the DMC Act and is a temporary structure and no permission is required for constructing a tin shed. It was also argued that as per clause 2.0.1 (d) of UBBL 2016 no building permit is required for construction or reconstruction of boundary wall or for placing any porta cabin within the plot line and the AE(B) concerned did not appreciate these facts. It was argued that as per the deed of agreement dated 13.06.1994, there existed one room and DPC in the subject property and the appellant has only repaired the existing construction and there is no fresh construction. It was argued height of tin shed has been raised only because of the height of adjoining property. It was stated that solar panel is to be

Contd....3/-

:: 2 ::

installed at a raised height so that sunlight can reach the solar panel and therefore the impugned order should be set-aside.

7. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the existing boundary wall is almost 16 feet height as can be seen from the photographs filed by appellant. The property is situated in Lal Dora area where no boundary wall is permitted and otherwise also as per UBBL-2016 clause 7.2.61, the maximum height of boundary wall can be 1.5 meter in plotted development and not 16 feet as raised by the appellant. It was further argued that as per the documents of the appellant there was only one room and DPC at the subject property and not boundary wall as claimed and as on date there exist 16 feet height boundary wall with a toilet and kitchen in the property and further the alleged tin shed is not a shed as defined u/s 2 (55) of the DMC Act and is a building as defined under 1.4.15 of UBBL-2016 and therefore being constructed without any sanctioned building plan is actionable.
8. I have perused the record. As per the appellant the subject property is a part of extended Lal Dora abadi of village Burari. It is stated that property paper of the

Contd....4/-

:: 4 ::

appellant prove that there existed a room and boundary wall in 1994. The deed of agreement relied by the appellant dated 13.06.1994 show that there was only one room and DPC on the subject property. There was no boundary wall as claimed by the appellant. DPC is a damp proof course installed at plinth level to prevent moisture, dampness extra. It is usually 2 centimeter thick. The DPC cannot and never be called as boundary wall and therefore the contention of the appellant that boundary wall existed ever since 1994 is wrong. The date when the boundary wall was initially constructed and is now alleged to be repaired remains unexplained. The photographs placed on record by the appellant today clearly shows that the height of the boundary wall is more than 15 feet. The same is a new construction. The appellant has stated that no building permit is required for construction or reconstruction of boundary wall as per clause 2.0.1 (d) (vii) of UBBL-2016. This provision shows that construction of boundary wall is permissible as permissible under these bye-laws. The said bye-laws are mentioned in clause 7.2.6. They talk about for residential plotted development and in any case the front wall can be of maximum 1.5 meter which is about 5 feet. In the present case the height of the boundary wall is more than twice of 5 feet.

Contd... 5/-

:: 5 ::

9. Coming to the construction of a kitchen and toilet. As per the documents of the appellant dated 13.06.1994 there was a room in the subject property. As per affidavit of existing construction, there is a kitchen and toilet of 9X14 feet in the subject property. This clearly shows that a fresh construction was raised by the appellant after erasing the room, constructed a kitchen and toilet in the property. The burden was on him to show that when it was constructed.
10. Coming to the said tin shed measuring around 101X43 feet. As per appellant this huge tin shed at height of around 18 feet has been constructed for installing solar panels. It is sufficient to note that no tin shed is required for installing solar panels. Irrespective of this, a tin shed is a building as covered under clause 1.4.15 of UBBL-2016. The same reproduced for the sake of convenience.

**BUILDING:**

“Any structure for whatsoever purpose and whatsoever material constructed and every part thereof whether used as human habitation or not and includes foundation, plinth walls, floors, roofs, chimneys, and building services, fixed platforms, varandahs, balcony, or projection part of a building anything affixed thereto or any wall enclosing or intended to enclose any land or space and signs and outdoor display structures, monuments, memorials or any contrivance of permanent nature/stability built under or over ground.”

Contd...6/-

11. As per this definition of building, any structure, for whatsoever purpose and of whatsoever material constructed is building and this definition is exhaustive definition. The tin shed constructed by the appellant of a size of 101X43 feet at a height of more than 18 feet stated to be used for installing solar panels will definitely fall in the definition of building under this clause.

12. Further, Section 2 (55) of DMC Act does not define a building or tin shed. It only defines a shed which is a temporary structure for shade or shelter. A structure raised by the appellant of 101X43 feet at the height of 18 feet for installing solar panels as alleged cannot be called a structure for shade or shelter. As already discussed, tin shed is not an essential requirement for installing solar panels. The appellant raised unauthorized boundary wall, constructed kitchen and toilet and also constructed a building in the form of huge tin shed which is covered under definition of building. I do not find any merit in the appeal. The same is dismissed. The demolition order is upheld.

Contd....7/-

:: 7 ::

13. 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  
23.02.2026

A.No. 100/26

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. Rambir Chauhan, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. K.D. Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent along  
with Sh. Sahil Kumar Toor, Patwari.  
Sh. Manish Yadav, Nodal Officer for the DDA.

Part arguments heard.

Put up for orders on **13.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 125/26

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. Manoj Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent  
alongwith Sh. Faiz Ahmed, AE(B).  
Sh. M.P. Bhargava, Id. counsel for intervener/applicant  
with Sh. Gaurav Batra, Secretary, NDSE-I RWA.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

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

An application under Order I rule 10 CPC filed on behalf  
of the intervener. Copy supplied.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **06.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 735/16 & 23/18

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. I Ahmad, Ld. counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

Previous cost has not yet been paid by the appellant. Let the same be positively deposited on or before the next date of hearing.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks a short accommodation on account of BCD election today.

At request, put up for producing the receipt of cost as well as 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  
23.02.2026

A.No. 99/18, 100/18 & 101/18

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. Dinesh Sharma, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Previous cost has already been deposited.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Ramesh Gupta is contesting BCD election and is not available today.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **24.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 206/18 & 207/18

23.02.2026

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

Previous cost has been deposited in both the matters.

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

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 **22.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 318/21 & 54/22

23.02.2026

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

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for arguments on **03.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 155/22, 193/22 & 246/22

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. Ashok Rajgopalan, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal and Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, Ld.  
counsels for respondent through VC.

Part arguments heard.

The AE(B) concerned is directed to physically inspect the property and measure the dimensions of the entire construction in the property and prepare a rough sketch plan and submit the same in the court with calculation in square feet as well in square meter.

Let the inspection be conducted on 10.03.2026 at 3.00 pm in the presence of the appellant and report be filed on or before the next date of hearing.

At request, put up for filing the status report and arguments on **08.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 745/23 & 801/23

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. Hardik Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.  
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 745/23 through VC.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 801/23.

Ld. counsel for the respondent requests for some short accommodation.

At request, put up for arguments on **20.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 17/25  
Adresh Kumar Vs. DDA

23.02.2026

Present : None for the appellant.

Dr. S.G. Asthana and Sh. Krishan Sharma, 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

23.02.2026

At 2.25 pm

Present : None for the appellant.

Sh. Krishan Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

None has appeared on behalf of appellant since morning in the Tribunal or through VC despite various calls. None had appeared on behalf of the appellant on the last two consecutive dates as well.

It is 2.25 PM. It appears that the appellant is not interested in pursuing this appeal. The present appeal is dismissed in default.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

23.02.2026

A.No. 52/25  
Kamlesh and Anr. Vs. DDA

23.02.2026

Present : None for the appellant.  
Sh. Anupam Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.  
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  
23.02.2026

At 2.30 pm  
Present :

None for the appellant.  
Sh. Anupam n Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.  
None has appeared on behalf of appellant since morning in the Tribunal or through VC despite various calls.  
None had appeared on behalf of the appellant on the last two consecutive dates as well.  
It is 2.30 PM. It appears that the appellant is not interested in pursuing this appeal. The present appeal is dismissed in default.  
Record of the respondent if any be returned alongwith copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 75/25  
Gaurav Jain and Anr. vs. DDA

23.02.2026

Present : None for the appellant.

Dr. S.G. Asthana and Sh. Krishan Sharma, 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

23.02.2026

At 2.35 pm

Present : None for the appellant.

Sh. Krishan Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

None has appeared on behalf of appellant since morning in the Tribunal or through VC despite various calls. None had appeared on behalf of the appellant on the last two consecutive dates as well.

It is 2.35 PM. It appears that the appellant is not interested in pursuing this appeal. The present appeal is dismissed in default.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

23.02.2026

A.No. 79/25  
Santosh Jain Vs. DDA & Anr.

23.02.2026

Present : None for the appellant.

Dr. S.G. Asthana and Sh. Krishan Sharma, 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

23.02.2026

At 2.45 pm

Present : None for the appellant.

Sh. Krishan Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

None has appeared on behalf of appellant since morning in the Tribunal or through VC despite various calls. None had appeared on behalf of the appellant on the last two consecutive dates as well.

It is 2.45 PM. It appears that the appellant is not interested in pursuing this appeal. The present appeal is dismissed in default.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

23.02.2026

A.No. 799/25

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. V.K. Mantoo, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
None for the respondent.

Record has not yet been submitted.

Let fresh notice be issued to the respondent/MCD for ensuring the presence of the counsel and for submitting the record, on the next date of hearing.

Put up for awaiting the record and arguments on **25.03.2026.**

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
23.02.2026

A.No. 573/13

23.02.2026

Present : None for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present appeal is allowed and stands disposed off.

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  
23.02.2026

A.No. 405/18

23.02.2026

Present : Sh. V.K. Mantoo, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present 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  
23.02.2026