

A.No. 210/26

16.03.2026

Fresh appeal filed. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Mohit Bangwal, 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 **05.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 212/26

16.03.2026

Fresh appeal filed. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Harsh Vashist and Sh. Subham Mishra, 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 **07.07.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken
against the property of appellant in pursuance of the
demolition order dated 11.12.2025. However, it is made
clear that no encroachment on the public land is
protected. The appellant is directed not to raise any
further construction in the property in question.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 213/26
Harsh Tyagi Vs. MCD

16.03.2026

Fresh appeal filed. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Anubhav Tyagi, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

This is an appeal against the show cause notice, which is not maintainable before this Tribunal.

At this stage, Id. counsel for the appellant seeks permission to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

At oral request made by the Id. counsel for the appellant, the appeal is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to challenge the demolition/sealing order as per law.

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
16.03.2026

A.No. 214/26

16.03.2026

Fresh appeal filed. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, 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 **08.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 216/26

16.03.2026

Fresh appeal filed. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Naveen Grover, 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 **20.03.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 217/26

16.03.2026

Fresh appeal filed. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. A.K. Jha, 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 **06.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 424/25

16.03.2026

Present :

Sh. Dheeraj Tanwar, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Atul Tanwar and Sh. Akash Tanwar, Ld. counsels for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has filed an application under Order VII rule 14 and an application u/s 5 of Limitation Act. Copy supplied.

Arguments heard on the applications and appeal.

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

It is the case of the appellant that neither the show cause notice nor demolition order were served and he came to know about the same when the copy was supplied after the writ petition filed by Sunil Tanwar.

Without going into this aspect, the delay is condoned subject to cost of Rs. 2,000/- to be deposited with Registry.

Both applications stand disposed of.

Arguments heard on appeal.

Put up for orders on **21.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 12.11.2019. 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/16.3.26

16.03.2026

A.No. 513/25 & 514/25

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Vikas Kumar, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Vasu Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent through
VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Sunil Mehta, who is a senior citizen, is not available today due to some personal difficulty.

Ld. counsel for the respondent submits that record shall be submitted during the course of the day as the AE(B) is on the way.

The appellant is directed to inspect the said record.

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 **15.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 729/25

16.03.2026

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC and Sh. Akash Tanwar, Advocate in person.
Sh. Amit Minocha, Ld. counsel for the intervener through VC and Sh. Krishan Kumar, Ld. counsel for the intervener in person.

An application under Order I rule 10 CPC filed on behalf of the intervener. Copy supplied to the appellant. Let the same be also supplied to the MCD.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

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

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks time to file the reply to the application seeking condonation of delay in filing the appeal.

Put up for reply and arguments on the application under Order I rule 10 CPC and the application seeking condonation of delay in filing the appeal on **23.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 745/25 & 823/25
M/s Unique Innovation Pvt. Ltd. Vs. MCD

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Rajesh Bhatia, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. S.S. Chauhan, AE(B).

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Record produced and perused.

Appeal no. 745/25 is challenging the demolition order dated 19.09.2025 issued in pursuance to the show cause notice dated 27.08.2025.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has argued that despite his reply dated 19.09.2025, no opportunity of being heard was provided.

I have seen the office record.

The show cause notice dated 27.08.2025 was served by pasting on 04.09.2025 providing 15 days time to the appellant to file its reply. The same was replied on the 15th day i.e. 19.09.2025 after excluding the date of service i.e. 04.09.2025. The impugned demolition order records that no reply has been received, which the appellant has placed on record at page no. 52 of the appeal which was addressed to the Executive Engineer instead of Assistant Engineer, who passed the impugned order.

....contd.2

: 2 :

Though, the appellant was wrong in submitting the reply with Executive Engineer, yet it is certain that opportunity of personal hearing was not provided.

Coming to the appeal no. 823/25 challenging the sealing order dated 27.11.2025 issued after show cause notice dated 16.09.2025. There is no material in the office record to show that the show cause notice was ever served upon the appellant.

In these facts, the demolition order dated 19.09.2025 as well as sealing order dated 27.11.2025 passed in respect of property no. 199, Measuring 100 sq. yard, out of khasra no. 237 min., extended abadi lal dora village Sultanpur, Delhi now known as new Mangla Puri, Tehsil Mehrauli, Delhi are set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply and documents submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority i.e. AE(B) on 01.04.2026 at 2.00 pm and before DC at 3.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

The appeal stands disposed of.

In the meanwhile, the property of the appellant be desealed.

....contd.3

: 3 :

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned to the AE and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 746/25 & 822/25
M/s Unique Innovation Pvt. Ltd. Vs. MCD

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Rajesh Bhatia, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. S.S. Chauhan, AE(B).

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Record produced and perused.

Appeal no. 746/25 is challenging the demolition order dated 19.09.2025 issued in pursuance to the show cause notice dated 27.08.2025.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has argued that despite his reply dated 19.09.2025, no opportunity of being heard was provided.

I have seen the office record.

The show cause notice dated 27.08.2025 was served by pasting on 04.09.2025 providing 15 days time to the appellant to file its reply. The same was replied on the 15th day i.e. 19.09.2025 after excluding the date of service i.e. 04.09.2025. The impugned demolition order records that no reply has been received, which the appellant has placed on record at page no. 52 of the appeal which was addressed to the Executive Engineer instead of Assistant Engineer who passed the impugned order.

...contd.2

: 2 :

Though, the appellant was wrong in submitting the reply with Executive Engineer yet it is certain that opportunity of personal hearing was not provided.

Coming to the appeal no. 822/25 challenging the sealing order dated 27.11.2025 issued after show cause notice dated 16.09.2025. There is no material in the office record to show that the show cause notice was ever served upon the appellant.

In these facts, the demolition order dated 19.09.2025 as well as sealing order dated 27.11.2025 passed in respect of property no. 248, Measuring 100 sq. yard, out of khasra no. 237 min., extended abadi lal dora village Sultanpur, Delhi now known as new Mangla Puri, Tehsil Mehrauli, Delhi are set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply and documents submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority i.e. AE(B) on 01.04.2026 at 2.00 pm and before DC at 3.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

The appeal stands disposed of.

In the meanwhile, the property of the appellant be desealed.

...contd.3

: 3 :

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned to the AE and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 747/25 & 824/25
M/s Unique Innovation Pvt. Ltd. Vs. MCD

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Rajesh Bhatia, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. S.S. Chauhan, AE(B).

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Record produced and perused.

Appeal no. 747/25 is challenging the demolition order dated 19.09.2025 issued in pursuance to the show cause notice dated 27.08.2025.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has argued that despite his reply dated 19.09.2025, no opportunity of being heard was provided.

I have seen the office record.

The show cause notice dated 27.08.2025 was served by pasting on 04.09.2025 providing 15 days time to the appellant to file its reply. The same was replied on the 15th day i.e. 19.09.2025 after excluding the date of service i.e. 04.09.2025. The impugned demolition order records that no reply has been received, which the appellant has placed on record at page no. 52 of the appeal which was addressed to the Executive Engineer instead of Assistant Engineer who passed the impugned order.

...contd.2

: 2 :

Though, the appellant was wrong in submitting the reply with Executive Engineer yet it is certain that opportunity of personal hearing was not provided.

Coming to the appeal no. 824/25 challenging the sealing order dated 27.11.2025 issued after show cause notice dated 16.09.2025. There is no material in the office record to show that the show cause notice was ever served upon the appellant.

In these facts, the demolition order dated 19.09.2025 as well as sealing order dated 27.11.2025 passed in respect of property no. 237, Measuring 100 sq. yard, out of khasra no. 237 min., extended abadi lal dora village Sultanpur, Delhi now known as new Mangla Puri, Tehsil Mehrauli, Delhi are set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply and documents submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority i.e. AE(B) on 01.04.2026 at 2.00 pm and before DC at 3.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

The appeal stands disposed of.

In the meanwhile, the property of the appellant be desealed.

...contd.3

: 3 :

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned to the AE and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 31/25 (M)

16.03.2026

Present : Appellant in person.
Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

Ld. counsel for the appellant has not been appeared since morning even through VC.

Be awaited for 2.00 pm.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

At 2.05 pm

Present : Appellant in person.
Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

At request made by the appellant, put up for 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
16.03.2026

A.No. 8/26

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent/
applicant.

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

Let notice of this application be issued to the appellant
through counsel for **07.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 148/26

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Saksham Mittal, Ld counsel for the appellant.

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

Let notice of this application be issued to the respondent for **11.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 184/26
Pawan Singh Vs. MCD

16.03.2026

Present : Ms. Nimisha Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. Rajesh Rohilla, AE(B).

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

As per the status report, no sealing order has yet been
passed in this case and only show cause notice has been
issued.

In view of the above, the appeal is premature and same
is dismissed with liberty to file fresh appeal against the
sealing/demolition order as per law.

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
16.03.2026

A.No. 145/11

16.03.2026

Present : Ms. Rashmi Singhal , Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard in this appeal.

As per the calculation sheet submitted by the respondent before the Hon'ble High Court available at page no. 42 of this appeal, there exists compoundable as well as non-compoundable deviations in the property.

As per the appellant, all the non-compoundable deviations have been demolished.

Respondent is directed to give fresh status report stating if any non-compoundable deviations still exists in the building and if yes at which floor and of which area, on the next date of hearing.

Record of regularization application of the appellant be also submitted on the next date of hearing.

At request, put up for further arguments on **25.03.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 375/11, 374/11 & 394/13

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Ashish Kumar Bhagat, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC in appeal no. 375/11 & 374/11.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta and Sh. A.L. Agnihotri, Ld counsels for the respondent in appeal no. 394/13 along with Sh. Maneesh Rajpal, ATP, T.P. Department, MCD.

It is stated for the ATP that a letter dated 09.01.2026 was sent to the DDA seeking clarifications about the land in between plot no. B4/123 and B4/156 to which no reply has been received from the DDA despite remainder dated 11.03.2026.

In facts, notice be issued to the DDA through Vice Chairman with directions to give reply to these two letters issued by the Town Planning Department and also to file status report about their reply in this court, on next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **10.04.2026**.

Copy of this order be sent to the DDA along with notice.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 232/19 & 484/19

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. D.D. Joshi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.
Sh. Ishan Jain, Ld. counsel for the intervener/applicant
Sh. Satish Bhati.

It is stated for the appellant that certain documents were supplied by the intervener through whatsapp on 14.03.2026 which are not legible.

The intervener is directed to file and supply legible print out of these documents within 2 days.

At request, put up for arguments on both the appeals 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
16.03.2026

A.No. 292/20

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Tarun Gulati, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Sagar Dhama, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Lalit Kumar is not available today due to bereavement of some known person.

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 **06.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 432/21 & 433/21

16.03.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal , 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 **10.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 29/24 & 161/24
Sheeba Ibrahim Vs. MCD

16.03.2026

Present : Mohd. Haris Usmani, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 29/24.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 161/24.

Appeal no. 29/24 is against a vacation notice, which is not maintainable before this Tribunal. The appeal is dismissed with liberty to challenge the demolition/ sealing order as per law.

Appeal stands disposed of.

Appeal file bearing no. 29/24 be consigned to record room.

Arguments heard in appeal no. 161/24.

Put up for orders on **17.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 177/24

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. G.R. Verma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Record has already been submitted.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to inspect the record and to argue the matter.

At request, put up for arguments on **13.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 132/24

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Divyanshu Pandit, Ld counsel for the appellant along with son of the appellant.
Sh. Syed Adil Hussain, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

An application along with pen-driver filed by the appellant to show that the demolition in the property was carried out even prior to passing the demolition order and also within 6 days of the demolition order.

Copy placed on record.

Let the same be collected by the respondent and reply be filed by the MCD/respondent on or before the next date of hearing.

At request, put up for arguments on **28.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

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

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. K.N. Singh and Sh. Prabhnoor Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 473/24.
None for the respondent in other appeals.
Ms. Anita, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

Status report along with pen-drive filed by the respondent. Copy supplied.

Part arguments heard.

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks assistance of AE(B).

At request, put up for further 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
16.03.2026

A.No. 823/24

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Amarnath, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel has gone to Gwalior because to death of his father.

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 **22.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 248/25
Meetu Jain Vs. MCD

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Ayan Dass Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard. Record perused.

This is an appeal challenging the order dated 14.02.2025 rejecting the application of regularization of the appellant's property bearing flat no. 133-C, Pkt. 1, Mayur Vihar, Phase-I, Delhi.

As per this order, the regularization application was rejected as joint application of all the owners of vertical block was not submitted.

The respondent failed to appreciate the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court in W.P.(C) no. 3280/2004 dated 23.05.2005 titled as '**Usha Devi Sharma vs. Commissioner MCD**', wherein the Hon'ble High Court held that NOC or approval from the other owners is not required. The respondent therefore, is required to consider this judgment as well as the policy of the respondent that now floor-wise regularization is permissible.

....contd.2

: 2 :

In these facts, the matter is remanded back with directions to the respondent to reopen the regularization application of the appellant in view of the above-said judgment of the Hon'ble High Court and their guidelines for floor-wise sanction/regularization dated 28.06.2022.

The matter is therefore, remanded back. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority for fresh hearing on 01.04.2026 at 2.00 pm. Till the decision of regularization application afresh, no coercive action be taken against the property of the appellant.

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
16.03.2026

A.No. 421/25

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Mridul Kumar Aggarwal, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

It is stated for the appellant that he has applied for certified copy of the record on 02.02.2026, but same has not been provided till date.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is held up before Hon'ble High 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 **11.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 539/25 & 540/25

16.03.2026

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

Part submissions heard.

At request made by the ld. counsel for the appellant, 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
16.03.2026

A.No. 667/25

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Puran Chand, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. A.K. Khosla, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.
Sh. Sajid Ahmad, Id. proxy counsel for the respondent in person.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Regularization application of the appellant is still pending for 24.03.2026.

In view of the same, put up for 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
16.03.2026

A.No. 89/26

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Ahasas Puri and Sh. Kushagra Bali, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent/MCD.
Ms. Surbhi Mehta, Ld. counsel for the respondents no. 2 to 7.

Matter today is listed for arguments on the interim application.

Ld. counsels for the respondent submit that the appellant has supplied a copy of the interim application as well as the application seeking condonation of delay in filing the appeal on 11.03.2026 and they need some time to file replies to these two applications and till then, no interim protection should be granted.

Ld. counsel for the appellant however, has pressed for interim relief.

Arguments heard. File perused.

The appellant has to establish a prima facie case, balance of convenience and irreparable loss and injury for interim relief. As per the office record, the sanction for installation of the lift was granted between flat no. 1 and 9, at ground floor of the Vashudha Apartments. The appellant prior to this appeal preferred a Civil Suit which was withdrawn and then filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and thereafter this appeal.

...contd.2

: 2 :

As per the MCD, the sanction was accorded as per rules at the same place between flat no. 1 and 9.

Arguments of the appellant that no permission from RAW has been obtained before shifting the essential services at this stage is of no merit as the lift is yet to be installed and whether there are essential services required to be shifted is yet to be ascertained. No case for interim relief without considering the replies of the respondents is made out.

Let the replies to the aforesaid applications and appeal be filed within 3 weeks with advance copy to the opposite side.

Put up for arguments on the applications as well as appeal on **15.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
16.03.2026

A.No. 103/23

16.03.2026

Present : Sh. Sourav Kumar, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent/MCD.
Ms. Renu Kuhar, Ld. counsel for the intervener through
VC and Ms. Anshi Srivastava, Ld. proxy counsel on
behalf of the intervener in person.

Written submissions filed by the Intervener.

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
16.03.2026

A.No. 714/25 & 715/25

16.03.2026

Present :

Sh. Praveen Suri, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 714/25.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Id. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 715/25.

Matter is listed today for orders on interim application.

The appellant has filed an interim application for deferment of pronouncement of the order on the ground that the appellants have filed civil writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court seeking separate Conveyance Deed or supplementary Conveyance Deed by dividing property no. WZ-92B and till then, the order should be deferred.

Same is opposed for the reason that apart from the ground of sub-division, there are other grounds as well for rejection regularization application including projection on municipal land and therefore, outcome of that Writ shall have no bearing on the orders on interim application.

Though orders cannot be deferred only because the appellants preferred to file a writ before Hon'ble High Court, however, in the interest of justice, the orders are not pronounced today.

Put up for orders on interim application 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

16.03.2026