

A.No. 277/26

07.04.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Jaya Goyal, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC along with Ms. Diya Jain, counsel for the appellant in person.

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 **19.05.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the impugned order. 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 280/26

07.04.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Binod Kumar, 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/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 **10.06.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the third floor of the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 13.06.2022. 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 285/26

07.04.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Hari Krishan, 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 **30.04.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the impugned 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 385/21
Yogender Kumar Gupta Vs. MCD

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Manish Batra, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC along with Sh. Rajat Tanwar and Sh. Abhishek, advocates in person.
Sh. Naresh Sharma, Ld. counsel for the respondent/MCD through VC and Ms. Beena Sharma, Id. counsel for the respondent/MCD.
Sh. Arush Bhandari, Ld counsel for the respondents no. 3 to 6.

Arguments heard on this appeal.

This is an appeal seeking revocation of the sanctioned building plan dated 23.08.2021 given to the partnership firm Bishambar Dayal Badri Prasad. The appellant has sought revocation of this sanctioned building plan on the ground that his deceased father late Sh. Dwarka Prasad passed away on 24.09.2020 who was a partner of this firm till his death, yet the sanctioned building plan was obtained in the name of the firm after his death on 23.08.2021.

On inquiry, during arguments, Id. counsel for the appellant admitted that the partnership firm did not dissolve after the death of his father and continued with the two surviving partners Mr. Sanjay Gupta and Sh. Rajeev Gupta.

....contd.2

: 2 :

Since, the partnership continued, the sanctioned building plan was obtained rightly in the name of the firm. Revocation u/s 338 of DMC Act can be done only on two grounds i.e. misrepresentation of facts or fraudulent statement made by the applicant while obtaining the sanctioned building plan. In the present case, none of these grounds exists. Hence, the appeal is devoid of merits and 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 539/25 & 540/25

Dr. Ramesh Chandra Madan & Anr. vs. MCD

07.04.2026

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

Ld. counsel for the appellants submits that he has instructions from the appellants to withdraw the aforesaid appeals and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeals in view of the fact that the appellants have applied for fresh regularization on 05.04.2026 vide application no. 50032538.

Ld. counsel for the appellant also requests for stay of the impugned order at least for 15 days from today.

Statement of Id. counsel for the appellant recorded separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by the Id. counsel for the appellants, the aforesaid appeals are disposed off as withdrawn.

No coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the impugned order till 15 days from today.

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
07.04.2026

A.No. 764/25

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy placed on record.
Let the same be collected.

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

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

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
07.04.2026

A.No. 787/25

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Sidharth Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent/NDMC through its Chairman/Chief Legal Advisor 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**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 798/25
Virender Singh Vs. MCD

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Lalit Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant along with
appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent
through VC.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The unauthorized construction in the property has been
regularized vide Letter no. AE/B/NRZ/2026/D-110 dated
23.02.2026 and regularization charges have also been
deposited by the appellant.

In view of this, the demolition order has become
infructuous and the appeal stands dismissed 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 886/25 & 887/25

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record
Sh. Vineesh Tyagi, Ld. counsel for the proposed intervener.

An application under Order I rule 10 CPC filed on behalf of the proposed intervener. Copy placed on record. Let the same be collected.

Reply to the interim application as well as reply to the application seeking condonation of delay filed on behalf of the respondent/MCD. Copy placed on record. Let the same be collected.

Record has not yet been received.

The respondent is directed to deposit the record with the registry within 3 weeks so that it can be inspected by the appellant.

Put up for arguments on the pending applications as well as appeal 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 8/26

Ankur Jain & Anr. Vs. MCD

07.04.2026

Present : Ms. Sonalika, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. Deepak Gulati, AE(B).

1. The record has been produced. It be deposited with Registry.
2. Arguments heard on the application of the respondent seeking early hearing and seeking arguments on interim application.
3. Arguments heard on this application and interim application. The appellants are seeking interim protection against the respondent to not to take any further action against the property till the decision of the appeal. The present appeal is challenging the revocation of sanctioned building plans of the two properties owned by the appellants. The sanctioned building plans were revoked by common order dated 01.08.2025 on the ground that there was sub-division of the larger plot, the property falls in Special Area and the sanctioned building plans under Saral Scheme was obtained under a wrong category of

Contd....2/-

:: 2 ::

unauthorized regularized colony and further the ground coverage and FAR are not as per special area regulations. UBBL-2016 and MPD-2021.

4. It was argued for the respondent that since sanctioned building plans were obtained on misrepresentation of facts and therefore same were rightly revoked and there are no merits in this appeal. It was further argued that even the regularization application has been rejected and demolition order has been passed which have not been challenged by the appellants and therefore the interim application should be dismissed.
5. Ld counsel for the appellants on the other hand has argued that the sanctioned building plans were obtained through Registered Architect and there was no misrepresentation on the part of the appellants. Further the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 29.08.2025 passed in W.P.(C) No. 6606/2025 and 8458/2025 permitted the appellants to bring the property within the norms of building bye-laws by removing non-compoundable deviations and excess coverage by themselves and thereafter get it regularized but the MCD is not permitting to do the same for which contempt petition has already been filed by the appellants before Hon'ble High Court and till then, property should be protected.

Contd...3/-

:: 3 ::

6. I have perused the record. Vide order dated 29.08.2025, the Hon'ble High Court after recording the submissions of the respondent/MCD that the sanctioned building plans issued to the appellants have been revoked, granted liberty to the appellants to bring the property within the norms of building bye-laws after removing the non-computable deviations and excess coverage. The respondent was directed to consider the regularization application *de hors* of the issue of the ownership raised by one Smt. Savita Jain. The appellants before me have already filed contempt petition before Hon'ble High Court against MCD for violating the directions of the order dated 29.08.2025. The MCD instead of permitting the appellants to demolish the non-compoundable deviations/excess coverage as permitted by the Hon'ble High Court is contemplating action to demolish the property. The office record shows that regularization application of the appellants was forwarded to Town Planning Department for seeking clarifications and the Town Planning Department of MCD on 16.10.2025 observed that the subject property falls outside the scheme boundaries of Sarai Rohilla colony. The regularization application was

Contd...4/-

:: 4 ::

scrutinized and following discrepancies were noticed:

1. The non-compoundable deviations still exist at site.
2. The proposal does not conform to the provision of UBBL-2016, MPD-2021 and prevailing regulations.
3. The observations/short comings conveyed vide letter dated 08.10.2025 had not been complied with.
7. The Town Planning Department did not reject the regularization application on the grounds mentioned in revocation order that the property is situated in Special Area or there is sub-division of plot. The regularization application was rejected on other ground including existence of non-compoundable deviations. Though the appellants have not challenged the demolition order and the rejection of regularization application but they have filed contempt application before the Hon'ble High Court for violating the directions of order dated 29.08.2025.
8. In these facts, the construction in the property should be protected as the demolition should be the last resort. The appellants have every rights to get the construction regularized as permitted by the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 29.08.2025.

Contd...5/-

:: 5 ::

9. In these facts the interim protection is continued till the pendency of this appeal.

Put up for arguments on appeal on 25.05.2026, the date already fixed.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 15/26

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Manish Kumar, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
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.

The annexure filed to the status report which is a demolition order dated 18.12.2025 is incomplete document as page no. 2 of this order has not been filed along with it.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to go through the record.

At request, put up for arguments on **02.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 173/26

07.04.2026

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

Reply to the interim application, reply to the application seeking condonation of delay as well as status report filed on behalf of the respondent/MCD. Copy supplied.

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 **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
07.04.2026

A.No. 211/26

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. A.K. Mishra and Sh. Robin Jaswal, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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

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

At request, put up for arguments on **04.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 367/15

07.04.2026

Present : Ms. Nayan and Sh. Muneeb, Ld counsels for the appellant along with AR/Prop. of the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks some more time to take instructions with regard to directions passed by the Hon'ble High Court on 26.02.2026 in W.P.(C) no. 7069/2015.

The respondent is given one last and final opportunity to file the status report on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further proceedings 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 1222/15

07.04.2026

Present : Ms. Preeti Sharma and Sh. Parvesh Bhargave, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Sanjay Sethi, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

Appellant seeks some more time to file the property tax record to show that the first floor of the property was existing prior to 08.02.2007.

Last and final opportunity is given to the appellant to do the needful.

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
07.04.2026

A.No. 372/16

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Bhagat Singh, L.R of the appellant through VC.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.
Sh. Piyush Jain, Ld. counsel for the respondent/DDA.
Sh. Kumar Yuvraj, Ld. counsel for the proposed appellant.

An application under Order I rule 10 (2) CPC filed on behalf of the proposed appellants. Copy supplied to the Id. counsel for the DDA.

Let the copy of this application be also supplied to the appellant as well as to the Id. counsel for the MCD today itself.

Put up for reply and disposal of this application 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 463/19 & 464/19

07.04.2026

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

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks some time to address arguments as he is not prepared today.

At request, put up for arguments on **21.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 374/20 & 376/20
Arvind Kumar Vs. MCD

07.04.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Shitij Vats, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 374/20.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 376/20.

1. Arguments on behalf of the respondent heard.
2. The appellant has already filed written arguments on the last date of hearing. None has appeared today for appellant despite waiting and calls till 2.30 p.m.
3. These are two appeals challenging the demolition order dated 29.09.2020 passed in respect of unauthorized construction of Mezzanine floor in the already existing ground floor of property bearing No.349, New Lajpat Rai Market, Chandni Chowk, Delhi in appeal No.376/2020 and the sealing order dated 26.11.2020 passed in respect of unauthorized construction of Mezzanine floor and unauthorized construction of first and second floor in appeal No.374/2020.
4. The brief facts necessary for disposal of these two appeals are that the appellant purchased the subject

Contd....2/-

:: 2 ::

property from the erstwhile owner Smt. Neerja Gambir vide sale deed dated 05.02.2020. As per this sale deed the property was built at ground floor and first floor of area measuring 17.17 sq.mtr each on both the floors. As per appellant the construction from basement to second floor was raised at the time of allotment and is existing since then. One writ petition was filed before the Hon'ble High Court bearing W.P.(C) No.3332/1998 titled as **M/s Ellar Traders Vs Govt of NCT** and in that writ vide order dated 15.02.2020 the Hon'ble High Court directed the owners to furnish undertaking to remove unauthorized portion beyond FAR of 300 within one month and if complied the shop shall not be demolished. It is stated that after this order the appellant brought the area of the shop within 300 FAR and therefore no action can be taken against the property being protected by the Hon'ble High Court as well as under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. This writ petition was later on disposed of 20.08.2014 with directions that till finalization and implementation of redevelopment plan, no unauthorized construction is to be carried out in the market and unauthorized

Contd....3/-

construction beyond FAR of 300 be removed forthwith. As per written arguments filed by the appellant the property tax returns produced by the respondent should not be considered and this appeal should be adjudicated on the basis of material available on record and since no fresh construction has been raised in the property the appeals should be allowed.

5. Ld. counsels for the respondent on the other hand argued that even as per the sale deed of the appellant there were only ground and first floor in the property and as on date not only there is basement and second floor but one Mezzanine floor has also been constructed and therefore, the protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 or provided by the Hon'ble High Court is not available to the appellant.
6. I have perused the record. The sale deed executed in favour of the appellant is dated 23.01.2020 and shows that there was only ground and first floor in the property as on that date measuring 184.90 sq.ft. equivalent to 17.17 sq.mtr each on both the floors. This document shows that there was no basement,

Contd....4/-

:: 4 ::

Mezzanine or second floor in the property. This court directed the respondent to produce the entire house tax record of the subject property. The PTR of 2006-2007 show that the covered area at basement and ground floor was 14.90 sq.mtr each and at the first and second floor it was 16.70 sq.mtr each. However, for the year 2017-2018 the covered area at the ground and first floor increased to 17.13 sq.mtr. without any basement and second floor. The area from 14.90 sq.mtr at ground floor increased to 17.13 sq.mtr which reflects that fresh construction was raised after 2006-2007.

7. Further, the office record produced by the respondent show that fresh construction has been raised at the Mezzanine floor and the photographs of the same are available showing fresh construction being raised in the property. The appellant not only violated the orders of the Hon'ble High Court dated 20.08.2014 passed in the case of M/s Ellar Traders (Supra) but also violated the status quo to be maintained under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 for claiming protection of unauthorized construction.

Contd...5/-

:: 5 ::

8. Since the appellant has raised fresh construction in the property after 08.02.2007 and also violated the directions of the Hon'ble High Court, I find no merits in these two appeals. Same are dismissed.
9. 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 385/20 & 560/24

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 385/2020.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Id. counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 560/24.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for order on **07.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 270/22

07.04.2026

Present :

SPA Holder of the appellant in person.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent.

Sh. Subhash Chawla, Ld. counsel for the respondent no. 7 namely Ajay Kapoor.

Sh. Paras Jain, Ld. counsel for the respondent Anand Deep Singh through VC.

None for Vinod Khanna, Rekha Khanna and Monika Khanna.

Appellant has filed an application to place on record the amended memo of parties. Same is taken on record.

Ld. counsel for respondent Ajay Kapoor intends to place on record additional documents. Reply has already been filed by Mr. Ajay Kapoor to this appeal. Additional documents can be taken on record only as per law.

Ld. counsel for the respondent Anand Deep Singh submits that he had already applied for certified copy of this appeal as directed vide order dated 20.02.2026 in the last week of February 2026 itself, but same has not yet been supplied to him till date.

Registry is directed to provide the copy of the appeal to the ld. counsel for this respondent within 2 weeks from today and reply to the appeal be filed within 2 weeks thereafter with advance copy to the appellant and should also be supplied to all other contesting respondents.

Put up for arguments on **06.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)

Addl. District & Sessions Judge

P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD

07.04.2026

A.No. 68/23

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Muneesh Chhokar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks time to file the status report regarding regularization application of the appellant. Let the same be positively filed by 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 331/23

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Raghunandan Sharma, Ms. Usha Devi and Sh. Nishant, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

One more appeal filed by the appellant bearing no. 222/22 was disposed of by this tribunal on 01.12.2023 and it is stated by the ld. counsel for the respondent that record of that appeal is also relevant for disposal of this appeal.

Let the record of that appeal bearing no. 222/22 be also called for the next date of hearing.

At request, put up for arguments on **12.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 162/24

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Pankaj Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Pranjal Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent/MCD through VC.
Ms. Shivani Kapoor, Id. Proxy counsel for the respondent no. 2.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent no. 2 as main counsel is not available today due to ill-health. The vakalatnama filed on behalf of the respondent no. 2 shows that there are 24 advocates in the office of Sh. Sanjay Rathi, Advocate and any of them can argue the matter. However, in the interest of justice one last and final opportunity is granted to the respondent no. 2 to address the arguments in the matter.

Put up for arguments on **18.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 373/24

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Anil Kumar Jain and Sh. Yash Saini, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Ms. Praveen Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Written arguments on behalf of the appellant have already been filed along with documents running into more than 100 pages. There is no application seeking permission to place these documents on record. Same are handed over back to the counsel.

One more application has been filed today to place on record the additional documents along with those documents. Copy supplied.

Let the copy of the written arguments be also supplied to the ld. counsel for the respondent.

List of judgments along with judgments also filed by the appellant. Let the copy be supplied.

At request, put up for arguments on this application and appeal on **18.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 449/24, 564/24 & 501/25

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Intervener Sh. Ravi Kant in person.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **08.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 931/24

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Manish Kumar and Sh. Akshay Yadav, Ld. counsels
for the appellant.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

The booking shows unauthorized construction in the shape of deviations against the sanctioned building plan at all floors and projection on municipal land. The appellant has disputed any projection on the municipal land.

The appellant is directed to file photographs of the property from all sides to show whether there are any projections on the municipal land or not.

Put up for arguments on **02.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 222/25

07.04.2026

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

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

Part arguments heard.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks some time to file the documents to show existence of the second floor of the property prior to 01.06.2014.

At request, put up for further arguments on **18.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 242/25

07.04.2026

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

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought by the ld. counsel for the appellant on the ground that he 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.

Put up for arguments **on 08.06.2026.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 334/25

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Jitendra, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Appellant in person.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

A short accommodation is requested by Id. counsel for the appellant on the ground that he is held up before the Hon'ble High Court.

It is stated by the Id. counsel for the respondent that another appeal no. 280/2025 challenging the demolition order was dismissed by this Tribunal on 08.05.2025. Ld. counsel for the appellant however submits that that appeal was against the vacation notice and not against the demolition order.

Infacts, the Registry is directed to tag the record of that appeal no. 280/2025 with this file.

Put up for further arguments 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 385/25

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Gaurav Deshraj and Sh. Naveen Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC and Sh. Akash Tanwar, Advocate in person.
Sh. Naveen Malik, Ld. proxy counsel for the proposed intervener.

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, 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 :

An application u/s 151 CPC read with Section VII rule 14 CPC filed by the appellant to place on record the additional documents, but there is no index to the documents to identify the documents. Let the proper index of these documents be filed. Copy of this application supplied.

Put up for disposal of this application and arguments on the appeal on **18.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 724/25

07.04.2026

Present : Ms. Gayatri Puri and Sh. Dev Karn Singh, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent No.1/MCD.
Sh. Satish Aggarwala, Ld. counsel for respondent No.2 and 3 joined through VC with Sh. Vinay Jaidka and Sh. Aman Tripathi, Advocate present in the Court along with respondent no. 3.

Cost for condonation of delay has already been paid by the appellant.

Reply filed by the respondent nos. 2 and 3 along with documents. Copy supplied to the appellant as well as to the respondent/MCD.

It is stated by the Id. counsel for the appellant that despite directions, the advance copy of the reply was not supplied to the appellant and she needs some time to go through the reply and documents.

In these facts, put up for arguments on **08.04.2026**, the date already fixed.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.04.2026

A.No. 29/26

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Navjot Singh Sodi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Vasu Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent through
VC along with clerk in person.

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 time to inspect the
record and to argue the matter.

At request, put up for arguments 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
07.04.2026

A.No. 874/16 & 875/16

07.04.2026

Present : Sh. Shiv Charan Garg, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta (through VC) and Sh. Ashutosh
Gupta (in person), Ld counsels 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
07.04.2026