

A.No. 236/26

24.03.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Mayank Arora, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

Submissions heard. File perused.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent/MCD through concerned Chief Law officer and also to the private respondent(s), if any.

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 **09.04.2026**.

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. 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 237/26

24.03.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Ashish Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

Copy of electricity bill showing the date of energization as 10.01.2008 in the subject property filed today. Same is taken on record.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent/MCD through concerned Chief Law officer and also to the private respondent(s), if any.

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 **06.07.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 11.03.2026. However, it is made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected. The appellant is directed not to raise any further construction in the property in question.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 238/26

24.03.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Aditya, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent/MCD through concerned Chief Law officer and also to the private respondent(s), if any.

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 **04.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 240/26

24.03.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Murari Tiwari and Ms. Nimisha Gupta, Ld counsels
for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The aforesaid appeal is against the vacation notice dated
19.03.2026, which is not appealable before this Tribunal.

The appeal is dismissed 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 241/26 & 242/26

24.03.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

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

Submissions heard. File perused.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent/MCD through concerned Chief Law officer and also to the private respondent(s), if any.

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 **16.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellants in pursuance of the impugned show cause notice dated 04.02.2026. However, it is made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected. The appellants are directed not to raise any further construction in the property in question.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 576/18

24.03.2026

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

An application under Order XXII rule 3 CPC for taking the legal heirs of the appellant nos. 1, 2 and 3 filed. Copy placed on record.

Submissions heard. Application perused.

The appellant no. 1, who was the mother of appellant no. 2, 3 and 4 passed away on 01.01.2026, whereas the appellant no. 2 Krishan Kumar passed away on 26.11.2025 and appellant no. 3 Anil Kumar passed away on 30.11.2025. Since, one of the legal heir of the appellant no. 1 i.e. the appellant no. 4 Sanjay Kumar was already an appellant, the appeal shall not abate.

In these facts and circumstances, the application is allowed and the legal heirs of the appellant no. 1, 2 and 3 are impleaded as appellants to this appeal. The amended memo is taken on record.

The appellant no. 3 left behind only a minor son aged about 13 years and as per this application, whereabouts of the wife of the appellant no. 3, who left him about 10 years before, are not known. In these facts, the appellant no. 4, who is paternal uncle of the minor son of the

....contd.2

: 2 :

appellant no. 3 is appointed as guardian of the minor son, till he attains the majority. The appellant no. 4 is directed to file his affidavit that he has no interest adverse to that of his minor nephew Kunal Vats.

Put up for arguments on appeal on **21.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 422/25

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Rupesh Sharma, Ld. LAC for the appellant through VC.

Appellant in person.

Sh. Subham Sharma, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, counsel the respondent. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

Status report along with reply to interim application is filed by the MCD, copy supplied to the appellant.

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 **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
24.03.2026

A.No. 627/25

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Divyanshu Pandit and Sh. Deepesh Arya, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Shubham Sharma, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, counsel the respondent. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

Reply to the application seeking condonation of delay and to interim application filed by the respondent. Copy supplied.

Ld. proxy counsel for the respondent seeks some time to file the record and status report. Let the same be filed on or before the next date of hearing.

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
24.03.2026

A.No. 645/25

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. K.S. Sharma and Sh. Shivam Singh, Ld. counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Manoj Kumar, AE(B).

Record has already been produced.

Part arguments heard.

There is no documents to show that the construction/property is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks some time to file the documents in this respect and to further argue the matter.

At request, put up for further arguments on **10.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 752/25

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Mehul Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

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

Time sought to file the record and status report. Let the same be filed on or before the 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 772/25

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Nimish Chib and Sh. Shivam Nayak, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

Let the record and status report be submitted by the next date of hearing.

The respondent has booked extended balcony and rooms set on the terrace of the third floor, whereas the appellant claims that there is only one room on the terrace which was duly sanctioned by the respondent on 09.05.2008.

Let the joint inspection be conducted at site on the terrace of the third floor with directions to not only ascertain the extent of construction, but also take the measurement of the room(s) existing at the terrace of the third floor of property no. 2325, Sector-B, Pkt. 2, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi. The respondent is also required to take photographs of the construction during the inspection.

Let the joint inspection be conducted on 27.03.2026 at 12.00 noon. The appellant shall cooperate during this inspection.

....contd.2

: 2 :

Put up for filing of the record and report of the joint inspection on **04.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 145/26 & 146/26

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Sagar Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Vikas Tomar, Ld. counsel through VC with Sh. Uzair Elahi and Sh. Arijeet Banerjee, counsels for the intervener Gautam Gupta.

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

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Record has already been submitted.

Arguments on maintainability of the application under order 1 Rule 10 CPC heard. Even if it is presumed that all the averments made in the application is correct, then also in this proceeding between the appellant and the MCD the applicant has no right to participate and he cannot become a party as there is a clear-cut judgment of Delhi High Court in case ***Hardayal Singh Mehta Vs MCD, AIR 1990 Delhi 170*** in which it is held that in the matter between the appellant and the MCD, no third person can join and become a party to such proceedings and in such proceedings the application under order 1 Rule 10 CPC is not maintainable. Any dispute between the applicant and the appellant has to be dealt with and to be decided by the Civil Court separately. Accordingly,

....contd.2

: 2 :

application moved by applicant under order 1 Rule 10 CPC is hereby dismissed. However, the applicant/intervener is permitted to file the documents, if any and to orally argue the matter at the final arguments stage.

At request, put up for arguments on appeal on **04.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 932/15
Chennai Network Infrastructure Ltd. Vs. MCD

24.03.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, 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/24.3.26

At 2.35 pm

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, 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 previous date 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 53/17, 473/17, 795/17 & 891/17

24.03.2026

Present : Mohd. Anish-ur-Rehman, Ld. counsel for the appellants.
Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 891/17 through VC.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld. counsel for respondent in appeal No. 473/17.
Sh. A.L. Agnihotri, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no 53/17.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 795/17.
Ms. Annu Arora, Ld. counsel for the intervener along with intervener Sh. Arun Kar through VC.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **29.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 100/17 & 281/18

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 100/17.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal and Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsels
for the respondent in appeal no. 281/18

Fresh status report filed on behalf of the respondent.

At request, be awaited for the report of the outcome of
the Standing Committee Meeting, 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 342/17

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC along with Sh. Yogendra, AE(B) in person.

Explanation furnished by the AE(B) in response to the previous order. Same is taken on record.

Fresh invalid notice has been issued to the appellant yesterday giving 30 days time to comply with this Invalid Notice.

At request, be awaited for outcome of the regularization application 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 748/17 & 768/17

24.03.2026

Present : Appellant no. 4 in person.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent
through VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant because of some bereavement in the family of the counsel for the appellant.

The appeal pertains to the year 2017. However, in the interest of justice one last opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter on the next date of hearing.

Put up for 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 987/17 & 988/17

24.03.2026

Present : Ms. Annu Arora, Ld. counsel for the appellant along with
intervener Sh. Arun Kar through VC.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent
through VC.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **29.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 891/18

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Jitesh Talwani, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent
through VC.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **30.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 372/19 & 398/19

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Id. counsel for the appellants no. 1 to 5, 9, 12, 16 and 17.
Sh. Abhinav Tyagi, Id. counsel for the appellants no. 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15 and 18 through VC,
Sh. Sharadandu Dwivedi and Sh. Vivek Verma, Ld. counsel for the appellants no. 10 and 11.
Sh. Sanjay Sethi, Ld counsel for the respondent no. 1 in appeal no. 372/19.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent no. 1/MCD in appeal no. 398/19 through VC.
Dr. Gaurav Manuja and Sh. Anand M. Mishra, Ld. counsel for the respondent no. 2.

Reply filed by the respondent no. 2 in appeal no. 398/19 along with annexures and amended memo of parties. Copy supplied to all the appellants yesterday and to the appellants no. 10 and 11 today in the court.

Coming to the appeal no. 372/19, the respondent no. 2 has not supplied copy of its reply to many of the appellants and also to the respondent no. 1/MCD. Let the soft copy be supplied to all the appellants and respondent no. 1 within a week.

Put up for arguments on both the appeals 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 20/22

24.03.2026

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

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for purpose fixed on **27.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 206/23

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Ayaz Ahmad, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought by the Id. counsel for the appellant on the ground that due to some personal difficulty, he could not prepare for arguments.

None has appeared for the respondent despite repeated calls since morning. No adverse order is being passed today. Fresh notice be issued to the MCD to appoint another counsel in the matter and for ensuring the presence of the said counsel on the next date of hearing.

At request, 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 191/24

D.P. Mittal Vs MCD

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Madhur Bhushan, Ms. Shailja Chandna and Sh. Harsh Tyagi, Ld counsel for the appellant alongwith appellant in person.
Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, proxy counsel for Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent , Ld counsel for the respondent.
Ms. Indira Marla and Sh. Tushar Verma, Ld. counsels for respondent No.2.

1. Arguments heard on the application seeking condonation of delay in filing this appeal.
2. The appellant has challenged the regularization granted to respondent No.2 vide order dated 27.06.2022 in respect of construction in the flat No.D-4/4142, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi.
3. This appeal was filed on 13.03.2024. The condonation of delay has been sought on the ground that the appellant came to know about the impugned sanctioned on 02.05.2023 in a Civil Suit pending between the parties and thereafter he could not file this appeal in time because of his old age of 83 years and chronic life long ailments. Further appellant came to know about filing appeal before this Tribunal only

Contd...2..

on 08.11.2023 through an order passed in that Civil Suit and therefore the delay should be condoned. Reliance was placed on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in **Mool Chandra Vs Union of India 2024 INSC 577**.

4. Ld. counsel for MCD and respondent No.2 argued that the delay is inordinate and the appellant was not confined to bed and therefore cannot take plea of his ailments. He was regularly appearing in person in that Civil Suit and the application is malafide and the delay should not be condoned.
5. I have perused the record. The appellant in this application has claimed that the copy of regularization order dated 27.06.2022 was supplied to him on 02.05.2023. The record of the Civil Suit filed by respondent No.2 shows that the said copy was supplied on 22.02.2023 and not on 02.05.2023 as alleged. Further the appellant who is the plaintiff in Civil Suit CS No.699/21 has been appearing in person with counsel before Ld. Civil Court. His presence in person is recorded in the order dated 03.11.2022, 22.02.2023, 02.05.2023, 22.07.2023 and 01.02.2024. The appellant therefore has taken a false plea of his ailments. Otherwise also the medical record filed with

Contd...3..

the appeal shows that appellant is under treatment for diabetes and hypertension and has been advised regular medicine for these ailments including restrict of salt, sugar, carbohydrates etc. and quit tobacco. These are life long ailments suffered by more than 50% of the population of Delhi and in no manner confined the appellant to bed. The appellant as per record of the Civil Suit had copy of this impugned regularization since 22.02.2023 and filed this appeal on 13.03.2024 after more than one year from the date of knowledge. Even if it is presumed that the appellant had knowledge since 02.05.2023 as pleaded by him, the delay from 02.05.2023 till 13.03.2024 is more than 10 months and is also inordinate and unexplained.

6. There are no merits in this application. The application seeking condonation delay is dismissed. Accordingly, the appeal is also dismissed.
7. 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 97/24 (M)

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Amir, son of the appellant in person.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Previous cost dated 13.08.2024 has not yet been deposited by the appellant.

Arguments heard on this application.

The appeal was dismissed on 13.05.2024. The present application was filed on 14.05.2024. In these facts, the appeal is restored to its original number subject to deposit of cost of dated 26.02.2024 and 13.08.2024.

The application stands disposed of.

Put up for arguments on the appeal on **25.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 693/24

24.03.2026

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

At joint request, put up for arguments on **22.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 818/24
Dinesh Shakya Vs MCD
24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Vikas Khatri, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments on the maintainability of the appeal heard.
Ld. counsel for the appellant has relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court dated 25.09.2025 passed in **W.P.(C) No.12444/2024 titled as Pradeep Solanki and Ors. Vs MCD and Ors.** to argue that when the demolition and sealing orders are not served upon the appellant, the appeal against vacation notice is maintainable.

Same has been opposed by the respondent for whom it has been argued that an appeal lies before this Tribunal only for orders and notices mentioned under Section 347-B of DMC Act and therefore, this appeal challenging the vacation notice and lock breaking order is not maintainable.

I have perused the record. The appellant has challenged the vacation notice dated 04.09.2024 issued u/s 349 of DMC Act and lock breaking order issued u/s 435 of the DMC Act 10.09.2024. None of these orders are appealable under Section 347-B of the DMC Act. In the judgment of Pradeep Solanki (Supra) the Hon'ble High

Contd...2..

-2-

Court in Para 12 of this judgment observed that any vacation notice ought to be challenged along with the said demolition order before ATMCD. This clearly shows that the appellant is required to challenge either demolition order or sealing order apart from the vacation notice. The appeal challenging only the vacation notice and lock breaking notice without challenging the demolition order or sealing order is not maintainable.

In view of the above facts and circumstances, the appeal is dismissed. Appellant is at liberty to challenge the demolition or sealing 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 1014/24

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Rahul Kumar Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Deekshant Kaushik, Ld. counsel for the intervener along with intervener.

Arguments on maintainability of the application under order 1 Rule 10 CPC heard. The applicant is the neighbor of the appellant. Even if it is presumed that all the averments made in the application is correct, then also in this proceeding between the appellant and the MCD the applicant has no right to participate and he cannot become a party as there is a clear-cut judgment of Delhi High Court in case ***Hardayal Singh Mehta Vs MCD, AIR 1990 Delhi 170*** in which it is held that in the matter between the appellant and the MCD, no third person can join and become a party to such proceedings and in such proceedings the application under order 1 Rule 10 CPC is not maintainable. Any dispute between the applicant and the appellant has to be dealt with and to be decided by the Civil Court separately. Accordingly, application moved by applicant under order 1 Rule 10 CPC is hereby dismissed. However, the applicant is permitted to file the documents, if any and to orally argue the matter at the final arguments stage.

....contd.2

: 2 :

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further arguments on **04.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 1036/24

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Mukesh Bhardwaj, Ld counsel for the appellant
through VC.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further arguments on **05.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 538/25
Shweta Jain Vs. MCD

24.03.2026

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

Reply to the interim application filed on behalf of the respondent. Copy placed on record.

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/24.3.26

At 2.45 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 the previous date of hearing 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 579/25

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Sunil Tiwari and Sh. C.M Shukla, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

Record has not yet been submitted by the respondent.

Let the record be submitted by next date of hearing.

Put up for further 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
24.03.2026

A.No. 759/25

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Gautam Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. S.G. Ashthana, Ld counsel for the respondent.

It is submitted by the ld. counsel for the respondent that the complete paper book has not been supplied till date, but for the appellant, it is stated that same was supplied through whatsapp on 09.03.2026.

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks time to take the print out of the soft copy and to go through the same. He also seeks time to produce the record.

At request, put up for filing of record as well as arguments on 26.05.2026.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
24.03.2026

A.No. 295/16 & 471/16

24.03.2026

Present : Sh. Raj Kumar Mittal, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 295/16.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 471/16.

Vide separate common judgment of even date, both the aforesaid appeals are 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
24.03.2026