

A.No. 290/26

09.04.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Vikas Khatri, 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 **15.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 291/26
Prakash Chand Khatri Vs. MCD

09.04.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. M. Jha and Sh. D.P. Mohanti, Ld counsels for the
appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The aforesaid appeal is against the vacation notice dated
27.03.2026, 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
09.04.2026

A.No. 292/26

Pradesh Kumar Vs. MCD

09.04.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Shiv Shankar Parashar, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Submissions heard. File perused.

1. This is an appeal challenging two sanctioned plans accorded to property no. 268, Khasra No. 138, 139, 140 and 141, Village Okhla, South-East Delhi-110025 measuring 10 bigha and one biswa. The appellant is a resident of Mandoli Extension, Delhi-110093. The appellant was asked to satisfy about his locus to file this appeal and how he is aggrieved person in terms of section 347B of the DMC Act.
2. Ld counsel for the appellant submits that the unauthorized construction in this property was challenged by one Shahzed Ali in W.P.(C) no. 446/26 before Hon'ble High Court and also by one Aqeel Ahmed before Hon'ble NGT, Principal Bench, New Delhi and the appellant is aggrieved person because of unlawful activities of private respondent no. 7 in whose favour these sanctions have been accorded. Ld counsel for the appellant as relied upon the

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case of M.C. Mehta Vs. Union of India W.P.(C) No. 4677/1985.

3. I have perused the record. The appellant is a resident of Mandoli Extension which almost 24 kilometers away from the subject property. The appellant may be a spirited citizen but cannot be said to be an aggrieved person as contemplated under Section 347B of DMC Act. He can be aggrieved if he is immediate neighbor or any of his easementary rights are infringed by these impugned sanctions. A person living a distance of 24 kilometers cannot be said to be aggrieved. Reliance in this regard can be placed on the following judgments:--
 - a. Rajendra Motwani & Anr. Vs. MCD & Ors. 2017 SCC online Delhi 11050.
 - b. Krishna Devi & Ors. Vs. MCD & Ors. W.P.(C) No.11253/25 dated 19.09.2025.
 - c. Anil Vs. MCD dated 29.05.2025 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in W.P.(C) No. 7957/2025.
 4. In view of the same the appellant has no locus to challenge the impugned sanctions.
 5. The appeal is dismissed.
- File be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 295/26

09.04.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Tarun Garg, Ms. Muskan, Sh. Bikram Chand Sharma and Sh. Naved Azam, Ld counsels 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 **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 10.03.2026. 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
09.04.2026

A.No. 296/26

09.04.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Gurtejhpal Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC along with Sh. Kunal Kochar, Ld. counsel for the appellant in person.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The appellants are claiming title in the subject property measuring 6 bigha 15 biswas of land on the basis of unregistered GPA, Agreement to Sell etc. No prima facie case for ex-parte stay is made out.

Issue notice of interim application(s) as well as appeal to the respondent/DDA through concerned 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 **10.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 787/25

09.04.2026

Present : Sh. Sanjay Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. Ashish Gautam, AE, NDMC, EBR and Sh.
Banwari Meena, JE (EBR)

The Copy of record has been produced. Same is taken
on record.

Part arguments heard.

On the request of Id. counsel for the appellant, put up for
further arguments on **28.04.2026**.

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.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 4/26 (M), 5/26 (M) & 6/26 (M)

09.04.2026

Present : Ms. Ankita, SPA holder of the appellant through VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

At joint request, put up for arguments 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
09.04.2026

A.No. 196/26

09.04.2026

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

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks time to file the record.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **18.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 233/26

09.04.2026

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Record has already been submitted.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **14.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 236/26

09.04.2026

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

Status report and reply to the application seeking condonation of delay is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The 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
09.04.2026

A.No. 5/14

09.04.2026

Present : Ms. Sakshi Jain, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant through VC.

Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Application for regularization has been filed by the appellant on 06.04.2026 only despite directions of two weeks given on 27.02.2026.

MCD is directed to file status report in respect of this regularization application on **24.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 189/14

09.04.2026

Present : Sh. Yash Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Nilesh Sahni, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Ashok Kumar, ASO, NDMC.

An adjournment is sought by the ld. counsel for the appellant on the ground that he is going to be engaged tomorrow and his marriage is scheduled for 20.04.2026.

The appeal pertains to the year 2014. However, 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 **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
09.04.2026

A.No. 263/17 & 50/19

09.04.2026

Present : Sh. Vikhyat Oberoi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Jasman Singh Sethi, counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Ashok Kumar, ASO, NDMC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel is not available today being out of station.

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

Put up for arguments on **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
09.04.2026

A.No. 436/17

Suman Devi & Ors. Vs. MCD

09.04.2026

Present : Sh. Lokesh Khanna, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Id. counsel for the respondent no. 3, 4
and 5 as well as newly impleaded respondents.

1. Written submissions filed on behalf of the appellant along with an application under Order XXII Rule 3 CPC to bring on record legal heirs of deceased appellant no. 1 Late Smt. Suman Devi. Copy supplied.
2. Arguments heard on this application as well as on the maintainability of the appeal.
3. Record shows that appellant no. 1 passed away on 09.07.2019 and the appeal stood abated in respect of appellant no. 1 as per order dated 15.11.2022. An application to bring on record her legal heirs filed after more than 6 years from her death and after more than 3 years from the date of abatement is not maintainable. Otherwise also this application has been filed by appellant no. 3 Smt. Usha Rani and not by the legal heirs of deceased appellant no. 1. Appellant no. 3 being not a legal heirs of deceased appellant no. 1 has no right to file this application.

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

For all these reasons, the application to implead legal heirs of appellant no. 1 is dismissed.

4. Coming to the maintainability of this appeal, the appellants in this appeal have sought revocation of the sanctions dated 23.12.2016 which was accorded to one Sh. Prem Prakash and Smt. Swaran Lata Kansil in respect of property no. 8699, Shidhipura, Model Basti Delhi-110005. None of these two were impleaded as respondents in this appeal. The appellants later on filed an application under Order I rule 10 CPC to implead Sh. Prem Prakash and Smt. Swaran Lata Kansil. Notice of this application was issued to them and it was stated by the counsel appearing for them on 08.02.2023 that Sh. Prem Prakash had already passed away two years back. The appellants took time on 08.02.2023 to verify his death and on 03.05.2023 informed the Court that his death has been verified and the appellants do not want to implead any other person for Sh. Prem Prakash. The appellants therefore gave up their right to implead the legal heirs of Sh. Prem Prakash.
5. This appeal seeks revocation of sanction given to Late Sh. Prem Prakash and Swaran Lata Kansil which is not maintainable in the absence of Sh. Prem

Contd....3/-

: 3 :

Prakash and after his death his legal heirs. The sanction cannot be revoked piecemeal and without impleading legal heirs of Prem Prakash the appeal is not maintainable for non-joinder of necessary parties.

6. The submissions of Ld counsel for the appellants that the private respondents should be directed to disclose about the legal heirs of Late Sh. Prem Prakash cannot be considered after more than 3 years when the counsel informed about his death on 08.02.2023 and later on 03.05.2023 the appellants stated that they do not want to implead the legal heirs.
7. This appeal is therefore dismissed for non-joinder of necessary parties.
8. 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
09.04.2026

A.No. 42/18

09.04.2026

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

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks adjournment on the ground that he is not prepared with the arguments.

At request made by the ld. counsel for the appellant, put up for arguments on **20.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 74/19

09.04.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Ms. Sakshi Shedha, ATP.
Sh. Rakesh Kaushik, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

Status report is filed by the MCD. MCD has requested the Vigilance Department to produce the original notings of page 1/N to 13/N stated to be of some other file. It has been informed that this request was made only two days before.

Let the original file be produced as per the last order, on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further arguments on **12.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 343/19

09.04.2026

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

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further arguments on **07.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 659/19

09.04.2026

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

Part arguments heard.

The appellant has not yet complied with the directions of order dated 07.05.2024 directing him to bring the house tax record of the subject property.

One last and final opportunity is given to the appellant to produce the same, if available, on the next date of hearing.

At request, put up for further arguments 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
09.04.2026

A.No. 687/19

09.04.2026

Present : Sh. Raghav Kapoor, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal and Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, Ld
counsels for the respondent.
Sh. Anunaya Mehta, Ld. counsel for the intervener Ms.
Maya Devi.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the appellant
to file the written submission.

The matter pertains to the year 2019. However, in the
interest of justice one more opportunity is granted to the
appellant to address the arguments in the matter orally as
well as to file written submission, if desired.

At request, put up for arguments on **15.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 173/20

09.04.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Madan Sagar, 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 **29.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 501/22 & 502/22

09.04.2026

Present : Ms. Aditi Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Rajat Rajoira Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

Arguments on the applications under Order VI rule 17 CPC heard.

The appeal no. 501/22 is an appeal challenging the sealing order where the date of sealing order was not in the knowledge of the appellant. Through this application, the appellant seeks to mention the date of sealing order in para 5 of the appeal.

The appeal no. 502/22 is an appeal challenging the demolition order dated 29.04.2014, but inadvertently, the date was typed as 20.04.2014 in para 5 of the appeal. Through this application, the appellant seeks to mention the correct date of demolition order in para 5 of the appeal.

Amendments sought through aforesaid applications are formal in nature. Both the applications are allowed and the amended appeals are taken on record.

An adjournment is sought by the Id. counsel for the respondent due to some bereavement in family.

...contd.2

: 2 :

At request, put up for arguments on the appeal on **22.05.2026**, the date already fixed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 740/22

09.04.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal and Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, Ld
counsels for the respondent along with Sh. Ramesh
Kumar Shukla, JSA CSPZ.

Part arguments heard.

Property tax record in original has been submitted by the respondent as directed. Same shows that as on 01.04.1999 there were 26 shops at the first floor and 25 shops at the second floor which are same in number as on date. The photocopy of this inspection report dated 01.04.1999 is taken on record and also supplied to both the counsels and original record is handed over back to the respondent.

However, for the third floor, on 01.04.1999, there was a covered area of 40 x 60 feet i.e. 223 sq. mtrs.

Let the respondent inspect the third floor of the property and file report about the covered area existing at the third floor as on date.

It is also relevant to note that as per the property tax documents filed by the appellant, the covered area mentioned in the letter dated 30.03.2009 at third floor, is 283.38 sq. mtrs.

...contd.2

: 2 :

Let the inspection be carried out in the presence of the AR of the appellant on 21.04.2026 at 3.00 pm and report be filed on the next date of hearing.

Further the certified copy of the house tax is also taken on record.

Put up for further 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
09.04.2026

A.No. 299/24, 300/24, 615/24, 616/24, 617/24, 618/24, 619/24, 620/24, 621/24, 633/24, 634/24, 635/24, 636/24, 637/24 & 646/24

09.04.2026

Present : Sh. Vinay Kumar Pathak and Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsels for the appellants.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 615/24, 616/24, 617/24, 618/24, 620/24, 621/24, 633/24, 634/24, 636/24, 637/24 & 646/24.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 619/24 and 635/24.
None for the respondent in appeal no. 299/24.
Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Id. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 300/24 through VC.

Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld. counsel submits that appellants are not contacting him and he wants to withdraw his vakalatnama in appeal no. 299/24, 633/24, 634/24, 636/24, 637/24 & 646/24. Ld. counsel is directed to intimate the appellants in writing in this regard and only thereafter, he can withdraw his vakalatnama.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Vedpal Rana 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 subject to a cost of 2,000/- in these nine appeals i.e.(. 300/24, 615/24, 616/24, 617/24, 618/24, 619/24, 620/24, 621/24, 635/24) appeal to be deposited with Registry of this Tribunal.

Contd...2..

-2-

Put up for arguments on **29.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 527/24

09.04.2026

Present : None for the parties.

None has appeared neither for the appellant nor for the respondent despite repeated calls since morning.

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for arguments on **21.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 155/25

09.04.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal and Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, Ld.
counsel for 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
09.04.2026

3.00 P.M.

Present: None for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal and Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, Ld.
counsel for 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
22.08.2025 and 06.11.2025 as well. It appears that the
appellant is not interested in pursuing the matter.

It is 3.00 PM. 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/09.04.26

A.No. 620/25 & 621/25

09.04.2026

Present : Sh. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard on the applications seeking condonation of delay in filing these appeals.

The appellant has challenged the demolition order dated 09.04.24 and sealing order dated 09.08.24 in these appeals filed on 09.09.25. As per the appellant, he was never served either with show cause notices or with the impugned orders which were received by him only on his application filed on 21.08.25 after the property was sealed on 18.08.25 and therefore, the delay should be condoned.

Same has been opposed for the reason that the appellant purchased the property on 06.03.25 and the show cause notices and the impugned orders were duly served upon Mr. Rakesh Nagpal, who was the then owner of the subject property.

Though it is correct that the appellant had no concerned with the suit property at the time of booking in April 2024 and there was no reason for respondent to serve notices

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

upon him, yet with an endeavour to decide the appeal on merits, the delay is condoned subject to cost of Rs.5000/- each which is to be deposited with the Registry of this Tribunal.

Put up for arguments on the appeal on **20.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 857/25

09.04.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Abhinav Tyagi, Ld. counsel for the intervener through
VC along with Sh. Mohd. Aliya, proxy counsel in person.

An application under Order I rule 10 CPC filed on behalf
for the Intervener. Copy supplied.

Reply to this application, if desired, be filed with advance
copy to the other side.

Regularization application of the appellant is still pending
and it is stated that invalid notice has been issued a day
before to the appellant.

Infacts, put up for arguments on the aforesaid application
as well as appeal on **07.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
09.04.2026

A.No. 123/14

09.04.2026

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

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
09.04.2026