

A.No. 198/26

12.03.2026

Fresh appeal filed. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Pulkit Arora, Ld counsel for the appellant along with  
Sh. Ashish Chawla, husband of Roopa Chawla.

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 **02.06.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 201/26

12.03.2026

Fresh appeal filed. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Satykam Saini, 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 on **06.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 202/26 & 203/26

12.03.2026

Fresh appeal filed. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Charanpreet Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant along with some of 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 **18.03.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant. However, it is made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 204/26, 205/26, 206/26 & 207/26

12.03.2026

Fresh appeal filed. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. R.A. Khan, Ld counsel for the appellant along with 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 **03.06.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 437/23

12.03.2026

Present : Ms. Jasmeet Kaur, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. Ranjeet Pandey, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

It is submitted by the parties that the proceedings have been stayed by the Hon'ble High Court till 25.04.2025 in W.P.(C) no. 9808/2025.

Be awaited for further orders on **06.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 551/25, 552/25 & 553/25

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Lalit Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, 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 deposited.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to file documents to show that the construction is old and occupied prior to 08.02.2007. The impugned demolition order however, records the cut-off date for protection as 01.06.2014.

Let the concerned AE(B) to be present in the court on next date of hearing to clarify about the cut-off date for protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

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  
12.03.2026

A.No. 593/25  
Meena and Anr. Vs. MCD

12.03.2026

Present : Ms. Junhai Prabhakar, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent. Fresh  
Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Ld. counsel for the respondent has submitted that the appeal challenging the demolition order bearing appeal no. 209/23 was dismissed in default on 02.01.2024 and same was not revived and no fresh demolition order has yet been passed by the respondent. It is further stated that this appeal challenging the vacation notice is not maintainable.

It was recorded in this appeal on 07.11.2025 that this appeal is not maintainable and the ld counsel for the appellant sought time to amend the appeal. Not only that same has not been done, otherwise also amendment shall not be allowed challenging the demolition order as an appeal against that was dismissed in default.

This appeal is not maintainable and same 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  
12.03.2026

A.No. 641/25

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Abdul Wasid, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.  
Wife of the respondent no. 3 in person.

Record in the matter has already been submitted.

Wife of the respondent no. 3 seeks copy of the appeal. It is stated for the appellant that same was sent by speed post in advance on 19.09.2025 and photocopy of the postal receipt has been produced. The respondent no. 3 claims that same was never delivered to her. In-facts, Id. counsel for the appellant is directed to provide the soft copy of the complete paper book to the respondent no. 3 or his counsel today itself.

Wife of the respondent no. 3 seeks some time to file the reply to the appeal. Let the reply by respondent no. 3 be filed within 3 weeks with advance copy to the counsel for the appellant.

Put up for arguments on **05.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 644/25

12.03.2026

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC and Sh. Shiv Chopra, Id. proxy counsel for the respondent in person.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks time to file the reply to the application seeking condonation of delay stated to be of 736 days. Let the same be filed before the next date of hearing with advance copy to the other side.

Put up for arguments on the application seeking condonation of delay 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  
12.03.2026

A.No. 651/25

12.03.2026

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

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy placed on record.  
None has appeared for the appellant despite repeated calls since morning.

The property in question was sealed in pursuance to the Inspection carried out by the Monitoring Committee. This Tribunal has no jurisdiction for the same.

The appeal is dismissed being not maintainable.

File be consigned to Record Room.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 16/26

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Suresh Chaudhary and Sh. Madhusudan Bhayana,  
Ld counsels for the appellant.  
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent through  
VC and Ms. Mahima Khera, proxy counsel for the  
respondent in person. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is  
taken on record

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Ld. counsel for the respondent/MCD submits that  
complete copy of the appeal has not been supplied to  
him. Let the same be supplied within 3 days from today.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has relied upon the  
judgment of the Hon'ble High Court passed in W.P.(C)  
no. 712/17 dated 14.03.2017 titled as KM Gupta & Ors.  
Vs. DDA to argue that the aspect of unauthorized  
construction is to be de-linked with NOC for permission of  
construction of lift.

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks some time to argue.

At request, put up for arguments on **14.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 136/26

12.03.2026

Present : Ms. Gunjan and Ms. Vani Garg, Ld counsels for the appellant.

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

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks time to file the status report as well as record. Let the same be submitted within 2 weeks so that it can be inspected by the counsel for the appellant.

At request, put up for arguments on **23.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 15/26 (M)

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Sagar Chouhan, Ld counsel for the applicant/  
appellant.

This is an application under Order IX rule 9 CPC for  
restoration of the appeal.

Issue notice of this application to the respondent for  
**08.07.2026.**

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 790/13

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Vikas Bhatia and Ms. Shivani Vashisht, Ld. counsels for the appellant.

Sh. Nilesh Sahwney, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Ashok Kumar, ASO, NDMC.

Arguments heard on this appeal.

The appellant was misusing the subject property bearing no. MB-7, Inder Prakash Buidling, Lower Ground floor-II, from 01.04.2006 to 19.06.2007 for a period of one year, two months and nineteen days. The property was sealed on 19.06.2007 and since then, is lying sealed except for a short duration when it was temporarily desealed for the purposes of removing the goods. The property was meant for storage purposes, but was misused for running an office of Chartered Accountant i.e. Professional activities.

The respondent earlier vide status report dated 16.01.2014 quantified the misuser charges as Rs. 74,672/- which were duly deposited by the appellant and as per the status report, the appellant was not required to pay any conversion charges/parking charges or interest thereon.

...contd.2

: 2 :

It has been argued for the appellant that since he is not getting the property converted from storage to any other purposes, he is not required to pay any penalty or conversion charges and the subsequent demand of these amounts raised by the respondent are unlawful and therefore, since the misuser charges have been deposited, the property should be desealed as the appellant has already undertaken to not to misuse the property for any other purpose except storage.

Ld. counsel for the respondent on the other hand has argued that after deposit of misuser charges of Rs. 74,672/-, a clarification was sought from the Monitoring Committee and in view of the note given by the Monitoring Committee and considering clause 15.9 of MPD-2021 and the subsequent notification of the DDA Dated 29.06.2018, the appellant is required to pay penalty and charges as notified in this Gazette Notification.

I have perused the record.

The appellant admittedly is not getting the property converted to any other use except for storage for which it was allowed and therefore, no conversion charges are required to be paid. The appellant however, is required to

....contd.3

: 3 :

pay penalty as contemplated under clause 15.9 of MPD-2021 read with Gazette Notification of DDA dated 29.06.2018.

The misuser period admittedly is admitted from 01.04.2006 to 19.06.2007. The penalty as provided in his Gazette Notification for NDMC area under clause 5.4.(b) for professional activities is Rs. 3072/- per sq. mtrs. The area of the subject property is 39.9 sq. mtrs. If the same is multiplied with a factor of 1.5, the amount comes to Rs. 1,83,859/- (39.9 x 3072 x 1.5).

The appellant has already paid a sum of Rs. 74,672/- and therefore, is required to pay the balance amount of Rs. 1,09,187/-. Let the appellant be deposited this amount within four weeks from today and will also furnish his affidavit to not to use the property for any other purposes except storage.

Put up for further proceedings on **16.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 970/13

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Vimal Dhingra and Sh. Gaurav, Ld counsels for the appellant.  
Sh. Anubhav Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

1. Arguments heard.
2. The present appeal is against the sealing action taken on the directions of the Monitoring Committee in respect of property No.16 and 17, Kaushalya Park, New Delhi.
3. This property has been sealed on the directions of the Hon'ble Monitoring Committee. Admittedly, a case of the appellant against respondent seeking ownership rights of the property on the basis of adverse possession is subjudice. Whether the appellant are the owners of the property and have a right to possess the property is yet to be adjudicated. The arguments of the appellant that since conversion charges have been paid by the appellant and therefore, the property should be desealed cannot be entertained at this stage. Moreso when the suit between the parties is at the final stage of adjudication. In these facts it will be better to await outcome of that suit and till then the property cannot be directed to be desealed in favour of the appellant.

In facts put up for arguments on **06.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 706/14

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Kunal Kalra, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.  
Sh. Pulkit Garg, Ld. counsel for the interveners alongwith  
intervener in person.

An application under Order I rule 10 CPC has been filed by the interveners, who seeks right to argue as granted to their late father Sh. B.D. Bhutani vide order dated 17.08.2016.

The applicants have claimed that they are the owners and in occupation of the undivided share of the shop at ground floor and mezzanine floor of property no. 3971, Chowk Ajmeri Gate, Delhi-110006.

Ld. counsel for the appellant opposed this application on the ground that the three applicants are not the only legal heirs of late Sh. B.D. Bhutani and if they had any right in the property along with their father as mentioned in para 4 of this application, they should have filed the earlier application under Order I rule 10 CPC along with their father and should have been the plaintiffs in the Civil suit and it is further stated that a letter of Succession of late Sh. B.D. Bhutani is required under Section 213 of Indian Succession Act.

...contd.2

: 2 :

Undisputedly, Late Sh. B.D. Bhutani, who was the father of these three applicants was permitted to argue being an owner/occupier of a portion of this building comprising five municipal numbers i.e. 3971 to 3975. The applicants being legal heirs even if, had any right in the property at that time, were not required to file separate application under Order I rule 10 CPC as their father was involved in this appeal. Further, if they did not have any right at that time, they have inherited the said right now after the death of their father.

In these facts, they are permitted to argue as permitted to their father as per the order dated 17.08.2016 and in terms of that order.

The application stands disposed of.

Arguments on appeal heard at length.

Put up for orders on **16.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 882/17

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Sumit Rana, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh.V.K. Aggarwal , Ld counsel for the respondent.

An application has been filed by the appellant to place on record some documents. Copy supplied.

Without prejudice to the rights of the respondent, the same are taken on record. The application stands disposed of.

The record of appeal No.883/17 has been received and tagged, but MCD record is not tagged with that appeal.

MCD is directed to submit the record on or before the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **11.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 536/18 & 803/18  
12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Rana Ranjit Singh and Ms. Saiyam Maan, Ld  
counsels for the appellant.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in  
appeal no. 536/18.  
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent in  
appeal no. 803/18.

Appellant intends to file the certified copy of the civil suit.  
Copy supplied. The appellant is directed to file these  
documents with list of documents.

It is claimed for the appellant that the subject property is  
in unauthorized colony and the protection is available for  
construction prior to 01.06.2014, for which a Gazette  
Notification has been relied upon. This notification is  
about new Aruna Nagar and not Aruna Nagar. Though in  
the impugned order the respondent has mentioned the  
date of protection as 01.06.2014, but the counsel seeks  
time to clarify the same.

Respondent is directed to specify the nature of Aruna  
Nagar and the relevant cut-off date for protection under  
National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special  
Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

At request, put up for arguments on **19.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 634/22

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Sanam Malhotra, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. S. Adil Hussain, Ld counsel for the respondent.

MCD record is not tagged with this appeal.

It is stated by the ld. counsel for the respondent that the said record was tagged with appeal no. 328/21 which has already been decided and the appeal against the same is pending for 18.03.2026 before Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge, HQ, Central, Delhi.

Let the MCD record tagged in that appeal be summoned for arguments on this appeal on **08.05.2026**.  
Robkar/request for summoning the record be issued after **18.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 98/23

**Munna Lal & Anr. Vs. MCD**

12.03.2026

Present :

Sh. Shiv Charan Garg, Ld counsel for the appellants.  
Sh. Karan Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

1. In view of the submissions made by the ld. counsel for the appellants that the appellants are very poor persons residing in JJ Colony, the cost imposed vide order dated 23.01.2025 is waived.
2. Arguments heard at length.
3. As per appellant he was never provided an opportunity of being heard which is essential for proper adjudication of the facts of the case.
4. I have perused the office record. The show cause notice dated 06.02.2023 and the demolition order dated 16.02.2023 of property No.C-13, DDA Market Shakurpur JJ Colony was duly received by the appellant No.1 under his signatures. The appellant also gave his reply to the show cause notice on 20.02.2023. It is stated in this reply that the show cause notice was not received in time. The date of receiving is not mentioned on the show cause notice under the signature of the appellant. The office noting records that it was received on 06.02.2023. As per show cause notice, the reply was to be given within three days of receiving of the show cause notice.

Contd...2/-

:: 2 ::

However, I am of the opinion that three days time given to the appellants who are illiterate persons to reply the show cause notice is insufficient time. Atleast 15 days time should have been given to the appellants. The appellants gave their reply on 20.02.2023 which was within 15 days from the date of show cause notice dated 06.02.2023. The respondent as such neither gave ample time to the appellants to reply nor considered the reply nor provided an opportunity of being heard.

5. In these facts, the demolition order dated 16.02.2023 is set aside with directions to the respondent to pass a speaking order after considering the reply dated 20.02.2023 submitted by the appellants and after giving personal hearing to the appellants. The appellants shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on **01.04.2026 at 2.00 pm** and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.
6. 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  
12.03.2026

A.No. 228/23

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Umang Tyagi, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

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

It is stated that the appellant wants to file some documents, but because of her chemotherapy, she could not contact the counsel.

The appellant is given last and final opportunity for arguments on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **03.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 737/23

12.03.2026

Present : Ms. Kamal Sant, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant seeks pass-over the matter. It is already 1.00 pm and pass-over is not possible.

Put up for arguments on **06.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 752/23

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Lalit Gupta, Ld. counsel for the appellant through VC.  
Sh. Anmol Ghai, Ld counsel for the appellant in person.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along  
with Sh. Yogender Singh, AE(B).

It is stated for the respondent that their record has now  
been traced and shall be deposited with the Registry  
today itself. Let the same be deposited.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks copy of the same.  
The appellant can inspect the same or obtain certified  
copy of the record.

At request, put up for arguments on **06.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 555/24  
Praveen Sharma Vs. MCD

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. B.S. Chowdhary, Id. counsel for the appellant through VC and the appellant is also present in person.  
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Subject property has already been regularized.

The appellant has also submitted photocopy of proof of payment of Rs. 5,02,434/- in this regard.

Since, the property has already been regularized, this appeal, which was against rejection of the regularization application, has become infructuous.

The appellant stands disposed of being infructuous.

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  
12.03.2026

A.No. 917/24

12.03.2026

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

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **17.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 1039/24, 1040/24 & 1041/24

12.03.2026

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

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Ashutosh Gupta has left for Hon'ble High Court in some part heard matter.

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 **05.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 61/25 & 407/25

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Vikas Sood, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
Ms. Vasu Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal  
no.407/25  
None for the respondent in appeal no. 61/25.

An application of the appellant to place on record the additional documents is pending, copy of which was supplied to the concerned AE(B) on the last date of hearing.

Let the soft copy be supplied to the counsel as well.

The documents sought to be placed on record through this application are some Gazette notification and orders and judgments passed in Civil Suit and PIL apart from few photographs.

Without prejudice to the rights of the respondent, the documents are taken on record.

The application stands disposed of.

Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 61/25 is not present.

Put up for arguments on both the appeal on **16.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 311/25

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Sandeep Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.  
None for the respondent.

Arguments heard on the applications seeking condonation of delay of about 45 days in filing the aforesaid appeal. It is stated that the impugned demolition order dated 21.03.2025 was received only in the Civil Suit on 19.04.2025. In these facts, without going into the merits of the application and with an endeavour to decide the appeals on merits, the delay is condoned.

The applications stand disposed of.

At request, put up for arguments on appeal 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  
12.03.2026

A.No. 362/25

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Pawash Piyush and Sh. Lakshay Jain, Ld counsels for the appellant.  
Sh. Jai Gupta, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent.

The connected appeal no. 347/25 was disposed of on 21.01.2026. Let the record of that appeal be tagged with this file till further orders.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Ashutosh Gupta has left for Hon'ble High Court in some part heard matter.

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 **13.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 370/25

12.03.2026

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

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Subject property has already been regularized.

Since, the property has already been regularized, this appeal, which was against the demolition order, has become infructuous.

The appellant stands disposed of being infructuous.

MCD is directed to remove the property from the list of booked properties from the Portal.

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  
12.03.2026

A.No. 133/26

12.03.2026

Present : Sh. Sandeep, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.  
Ms. Vasu Singh. Ld counsel for the respondent.  
Sh. Sourav Ghosh, Ld. counsel for the  
applicant/intervener Mohd. Ali.

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

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as  
main counsel has been suffering from severe back pain  
and is unable to come today.

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

Put up for arguments on **16.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)  
Addl. District & Sessions Judge  
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD  
12.03.2026

A.No. 41/20

12.03.2026

Present : None for the appellant.  
Sh. S. Adil Hussain, 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  
12.03.2026

A.No. 298/21

12.03.2026

Present : Appellant in person.  
Sh. Abhishek Kumar, Ld Proxy counsel for the  
respondent joined through VC.

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  
12.03.2026