

A.No. 293/26

10.04.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Nitin Kumar, 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 **04.06.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant upto fifth floor and the water tank in the property, 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
10.04.2026

A.No. 294/26

10.04.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : None 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 **21.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 643/25

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Jayant Garg, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

Sh. Varun Sharma, Id. Proxy counsel for the respondent

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy placed on record.

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

At request, put up with connected appeal on **22.04.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 807/25

10.04.2026

Present : None for the parties.

Record has already been submitted.

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for arguments on **08.06.2026**

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 859/25

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Sudhir Kumar and Ms. Neha, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Sunil Kumar Kharb, ASO/LI-80.

It is stated by the ld. counsel for the respondent that the previous owner Mohd. Rabbani also filed appeal against this sealing order which was dismissed and record of that appeal will be required for disposal of this appeal.

Infacts, the let the record of appeal no. 153/2019 titled as Mohd. Rabbani Vs.MCD be summoned for next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **09.06.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 2/26 (M)

Sneh Garg Vs. MCD

10.04.2026

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

1. Arguments heard on the application seeking review of the judgment dated 24.12.2025 filed by the MCD on the ground that this court has no jurisdiction to entertain this appeal as a sealing action in respect of the property bearing flat no. 192A, Block, AG-1, Ground Floor, Vikas Puri, New Delhi was in pursuance to the directions of the Monitoring Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.
2. I have perused the record. The complaint made by one Ms Meenakshi in respect of subject property was addressed to the Monitoring Committee and the Monitoring Committee sought report from MCD on her complaint and directed that the property shall be sealed for non-payment of registration charges vide order dated 04.12.2025. Thereafter, the MCD issued the sealing order dated 12.12.2025 which was approved by the Monitoring Committee on 19.12.2025.

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

3. Though, it is correct as argued for the appellant that the Monitoring Committee mentioned in the notings on 04.12.2025 that the report of MCD is misleading and MCD has failed to place on record the part of the property i.e. residentially used is occupied by the practicing Doctor and the MCD passed sealing order on some other ground but the facts remains that the sealing was directed by the Monitoring Committee on 04.12.2025.
4. In view of the directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in M.C. Mehta Vs. UOI, if any property is sealed on the directions of the Monitoring Committee, the jurisdiction lies with Monitoring Committee and not with any other Court.
5. In view of the same the review application is allowed. The order dated 24.12.2025 is set-aside and appeal is dismissed being not maintainable.
6. Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 65/26

Ved Prakash Yadav & Anr. Vs. MCD

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Udit Vaghela and Sh. Saarthak Sethi, Ld counsels for the appellants.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

1. Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.
2. The record has been produced. It be deposited with Registry.
3. Arguments heard on interim application.
4. Ld counsel for the appellants has argued that writ petition has already been filed before Hon'ble High Court challenging the order of the respondent rejecting the regularization application of the appellants. Further, the property is being used for godown since long prior to 01.06.2014 and therefore is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 and therefore the property should be protected by interim order till disposal of this appeal.
5. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand has argued that the premises bearing Khasra. No. 1005 to 1008, Phirni Road near Rao Mansa Ram School, New Delhi-110097 is being used for commercial activities in the form of warehouse in violation of permissible

Contd..2/-

: 2 :

use and in contravention to MPD-2021 and therefore show cause notice under Section 345A dated 21.07.2025 was issued and the reply of the appellant dated 28.07.2025 was considered and the sealing order dated 12.12.2025 was passed. It was stated that the property cannot be regularized as the same is not in conformity with the notification dated 21.06.2018 relating to standalone godown and otherwise there is no protection granted to the appellant in the writ petition stated to be filed before Hon'ble High Court and therefore no interim protection can be granted.

6. I have perused the record. Admittedly, the regularization application of the appellant has been rejected as the property does not adhere to the policy dated 21.06.2018 in respect of godown/clusters existing in non confirming area. Though appellant has filed documents to show that the structure was existing prior to 01.06.2014 but there no documents to show that the unauthorized misused is prior to 01.01.2006. Under the National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011, the unauthorized construction in village abadi is protected if being prior to 01.06.2014 but

Contd...3/-

: 3 :

unauthorized development which includes misuser is protected only if existing prior to 01.01.2006. The appellant has not been able to show that the said misuser is in existence prior to 01.01.2006 and the regularization has already been rejected. There is no prime-facie case in favour of the appellant. The interim application is dismissed.

Put up for argument on appeal on 21.08.2026.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 208/26

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Raj Kumar along with Sh. Shivam Chaudhary, Ld
counsels for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

None has appeared for the respondent despite service
and repeated calls and awaiting till 2.35 pm.

In these facts, till next date of hearing, no coercive action
be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of
the demolition order dated 16.04.2024. However, it is
made clear that no encroachment on the public land is
protected.

Fresh notice be issued to the MCD for ensuring the
presence of the counsel on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **19.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 296/26

Arya Samaj Sainik Farms Dharmarth Samiti Vs. MCD

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Tvideep Pias, Sr.Advocate along with Sh. Gurtejhpal Singh, Ms. Sakshi and Sh. Kunal Kochar, Ld. counsels for the appellants in person.
Sh. Anupam Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC along with Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Nodal Officer, DDA.

Arguments heard on the interim application.

It is argued for the appellants that the appellants are the owner of Khasra. No. 581 and 583 of Village Maidan Garhi of area measuring 3 bigha 17 biswa and 2 bigha 18 biswa respectively and are in continuous possession since then and cannot be dispossessed nor the property can be demolished without following due process of law and therefore the impugned demolition order dated 24.03.2026 passed in some hurry by the respondent should be stayed till disposal of appeal. Reliance has been placed on the following judgments: -

- a. Bal Kishan Gupta Vs. DDA 2024 : DHC : 765.
- b. DCM Limited Vs. DDA 2013 : DHC : 1482 – DB.
- c. Government of Andhra Pradesh Vs. Thummala Krishna Rao & Anr. (1982) 2 Supreme Court cases 134.

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

Ld counsel for the DDA on the other hand argued that subject property has already been demolished and the interim application is now infructuous and sometime be given to file record and reply to the appeal.

In view of the submissions made by the Ld. counsel for the DDA let the status report with photographs showing the demolishing of the subject property be filed on the next date of hearing with record. Till then status quo be maintained by the parties. The appellant shall not raise any construction in the property till next date of hearing.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 265/18
Sushila Devi Vs. MCD

10.04.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Naresh Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.
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/10.04.2026

At 2.40 pm

Present : Sh. S.C. Joshi, Id. counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Naresh Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

At request, put up for arguments on **25.05.2026**.
Interim orders, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

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

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Ashish Kumar Bhagat , Ld counsel for the appellant through VC and Sh. Akash Singh, Advocate in person.
Sh. A.L. Agnihotri, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 349/13 along with Sh. Maneesh Rajpal, ATP, Town Planning Department, MCD.
None for the respondent in appeal nos. 375/11 & 374/11.
Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Nodal Officer from DDA along with Sh. Harendra Singh, Tehsildar, DDA and Sh. Lalit Bidhwre, Kanoogo, DDA, Sh. Sachin Kumar, EE and Sh. Kamal Meena, EE.

Status report filed by the DDA. Copy supplied.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that this land after acquisition was released by the DDA and the status report filed today is not correct.

Infacts, put up for arguments 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
10.04.2026

A.No. 1092/15 & 375/17

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Anuj Garg and Ms. Parul Verma, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Sagar Dhama, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 1092/15.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 375/17.

Part arguments heard.

At request, put up for further arguments on **15.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 249/18

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. I. Ahmad, Id. counsel for the appellant along with appellant in person.
Sh. Sanjay Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Dharambir Singh, Consultant, NDMC.

An adjournment is sought by the Id. counsel for the appellant on the ground that he is not prepared with the case.

The appeal pertains to the year 2018. However, in the interest of justice one last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter.

At request, 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
10.04.2026

A.No. 344/18

Vijender Sharma and Bijender Singh Sharma Vs. MCD

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Ravinder Kumar and Sh. Anil Kumar, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Ms. Arti Bansal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard. Record perused.

The appellant has challenged the impugned demolition order dated 30.01.2014 in respect of unauthorized construction at ground, first and second floor of property no. D-3, Main Road, Ganga Vihar, Gokul Puri, Delhi.

As per the status report dated 27.03.2019, the cut-off date for protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 of the subject property is 01.06.2014.

In view of the same, the demolition order is upheld, but is kept in abeyance in respect of property of the appellant till this Act is in force.

The respondent is at liberty to take action once the Act ceases to be in force.

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
10.04.2026

A.No. 504/18 & 513/18

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Naveen Arora, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 504/18.
Sh. Ranjeet Pandey, Id. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 513/18.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is not available today due to some personal difficulty.

The appeals pertain to year 2018. However, in the interest of justice another last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter.

At request, 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
10.04.2026

A.No. 607/19

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Suresh Kumar, husband of the appellant in person.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments on behalf of the respondent heard and concluded.

Pass over sought by the appellant for 2.00 pm, which is not possible due to heavy cause list.

One last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter on the next date of hearing.

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
10.04.2026

A.No. 207/20 & 208/20
Ashok Kumar and Anr. Vs. MCD

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Shoaib Khan and Shahrukh Khan, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant no. 2 in person.
Sh. Umesh K. Barnwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent through VC.

Arguments heard on the appeals.

The appellants have challenged the demolition order dated 20.06.2018 and the sealing order dated 19.09.2018 on several grounds including non-service of the show cause notices dated 01.06.2018 and 20.08.2018 respectively.

I have perused the office record.

The show cause notice u/s 344 (1) read with 343 DMC Act dated 01.06.2018 was served through pasting whereas there is no service of show cause notice dated 20.08.2018 under Section 345 A DMC Act.

Though, it was argued for the respondent that same were served through pasting, but there is no photographs nor any witness to the said pasting.

The Commissioner, MCD in its circular itself has given certain directions for service through pasting vide circular dated 15.04.2010 Which is as under :-

“It is observed that the service of show cause notice upon owner is found unsatisfactory and unreliable and, as such, most of the appeals, filed against the demolition orders, are allowed by the courts for lack of service of show cause notice upon owner. It has, therefore, been decided that pasting of notice should be supported by photographic evidence. The JE concerned will ensure the photographic evidence of pasting of notice and such evidence will form part of U/C and sealing files. EE(B) of respective zone shall ensure the uploading of information regarding unauthorized construction on MCD website soon after the passing of the necessary orders for demolition”.

Even another circular bearing No.LAW/SOUTHDMC/ 2016/1227 Dt. 06.12.2016 was by the Chief Law Officer, SDMC which is reproduce as below:-

‘It has been observed that the Executive Engineers of SDMC are passing demolition order/sealing order without verifying the service of show cause notice. The Appellate Tribunal has also observed that this is very careless attitude or some deliberate act to give benefit to the property owner as they knew very well that case will not stand to the scrutiny of the Court on this ground alone. Therefore, the Quasi Judicial Authority should ensure that service has been done properly before passing any order under DMC Act.

Further the service, as far as possible should be done by way of speed post and a copy of internet delivery report with postal receipt should be kept on record and where service is not possible and pasting is to be done,

photograph of pasting be taken and signatures of witness be obtained with their name and address.

In number of cases, the service of show cause notice of demolition or sealing is done by way of pasting or speed post, but necessary proof with regard to its service by pasting and signatures of two witnesses is not taken by the department. In case of service by speed post, the tracking report showing the service of the same upon the owner/builder is not placed in the u/c file, with the result the stay order are passed and finally appeals are allowed.

All concerned are hereby requested to kindly take note of the aforesaid orders and to ensure the compliance of such orders.”

In view of the same, principles of natural justice are violated as the show cause notices were not served. Hence, the demolition order dated 20.06.2018 and the sealing order dated 19.09.2018 passed in respect of property house no. T-265 A/5, Ground floor, Chirag Delhi, New Delhi-110017 are set aside. The appeals are allowed.

The aforesaid demolition order and sealing orders are set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply to be submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 29.04.2026 at 2.00 pm and the

speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

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
10.04.2026

A.No. 66/21

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Anil Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

It is stated by the Id. counsel for the appellant that the subject property is a part of unauthorized colony, for which the Govt. of NCT, has now decided to regularize the construction subject to fulfillment of terms and conditions contained therein.

He seeks some time to apply for the same and to get the property regularized.

Infacts, put up for arguments on **28.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 217/21

10.04.2026

Present : Ms. Sana Ansari, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC along with Sh. I. Ahmad, Advocate along with son of the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.

Pass over sought by Id. counsel for the appellant for 2.00 pm, which is not possible due to heavy cause list.

One last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **16.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 258/21
Ashok Arora Vs. MCD

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Arun Kumar and Sh. Sumit Gaba, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

1. Arguments heard at length.
2. This is an appeal challenging the demolition order dated 11.11.2013 passed in respect of unauthorized construction in the shape of deviations against sanctioned building plan in property No.A-2/12, Janakpuri, New Delhi.
3. The appellant has argued that the show cause notice was neither issued in his name nor was served upon the appellant and despite that this demolition order was passed.
4. I have perused the office record. The show cause notice dated 01.11.2013 was issued in the name of brother of the appellant, namely, Jagdish Arora who resides in the rear portion of the property. It was sent through speed post and was also served by pasting but neither there is track consignment report nor any photograph of pasting or any witness to the pasting.
5. In these facts, the demolition order dated 11.11.2013 is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

a speaking order after considering the reply to be submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on **28.04.2026 at 2.00 pm** and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

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
10.04.2026

A.No. 1091/24

Ashok Arora Vs. MCD

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Arun Kumar and Sh. Sumit Gaba, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

1. Arguments heard at length.
2. This is an appeal challenging the sealing order dated 12.12.2024 passed in respect of property No.A-2/12, Janakpuri, New Delhi.
3. The appellant has challenged this order on the ground that the respondent failed to point out the deviations in the property despite directions of this Court and is a non-speaking order and should be set aside.
4. Ld. counsel for the respondent on the other hand has argued that this matter was remanded back in earlier appeals No.185/24, 192/24 and 270/24 and therefore, the appellant is well aware about the deviations in the property against sanctioned building plan and there is no infirmity in the impugned order.
5. I have perused the record. Earlier a sealing order dated 23.02.2024 was passed in respect of this property. The appellant with two others filed three appeals No. 185/24, 192/24 and 270/24 before this Tribunal and the matter was remanded back vide

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

order dated 07.05.2024 with directions to the respondent to pass speaking order after fresh hearing. Thereafter, the impugned order has been passed. The relevant portion of this order records that the appellant has failed to regularize the property and failed to rebut the charges of unauthorized construction as communicated through show cause notice dated 21.08.2023 and therefore the property should be sealed.

6. A perused of the show cause notice dated 21.08.2023 show that it does not specify the extent of deviations in the property. It simply says "*unauthorized construction in the shape of deviations against sanctioned building plan*". The show cause notice itself is silent upon the deviations and once the matter was remanded back, the respondent was required to explain the extent of deviations in the speaking order as required as per the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed In re : directions in the matter of demolition of structure 2024 INSC 866.
7. In these facts, the impugned sealing order is liable to be set aside as it does not explain the extent of deviations in the property as against the sanctioned building plan nor same are mentioned in the show cause notice dated 21.08.2023.

Contd...3/-

: 3 :

8. In these facts, the sealing order dated 12.12.2024 is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply to be submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 28.04.2026 at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing. The property in question be desealed within 2 weeks 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
10.04.2026

A.No. 242/21

Ashok Arora Vs. MCD

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Arun Kumar and Sh. Sumit Gaba, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

1. Arguments heard at length.
2. This is an appeal challenging the rejection letter dated 04.08.2021 rejecting the regularization application of the appellant of property No.A-2/12, Janakpuri, New Delhi.
3. This order has been challenged on the ground that the respondent failed to appreciate that all the non-compoundable deviations in the portion in possession of the appellant has already been demolished and the appellant has complied with all the formalities and despite that the regularization application was rejected.
4. I have perused the record. The appellant though claims that he applied for regularization of front half portion of the property in his possession of about 175 sq.mtr. but his regularization documents show that he applied for entire plot of 351 sq.mtr. The undertaking, the affidavit filed by the appellant are in respect of area measuring 351 sq.mtr. and specifically stating

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

that there is no sub-division in the plot. Same is contrary to the arguments made by Id counsel for the appellant who stated that appellant is seeking regularization only for an area of 175 sq.mtr in possession of the appellant.

5. In these facts the regularization cannot be granted for 175 sq.mtr when it was applied for 351 sq.mtr. The appellant is required to apply afresh for regularization of the portion in his possession. The appeal is devoid of merits. Same is dismissed.
6. Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 151/23

10.04.2026

Present : Ms. Ritika Salmana, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant through VC along with appellant in person.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Intervener in person.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Ms. Parul Agarwal has gone to the school to attend PTM of her child.

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 **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
10.04.2026

A.No. 589/23, 590/23, 591/23 & 592/23

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Mansoor Malik, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal , Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Sanjeev Nasiar has met with an accident and is not available today.

Record shows that Sh. Dalip Rastogi, is also counsel in this case apart from Sh. Sanjeev Nasiar and is present today in the court in some other matter.

It has been stated that Sh. Sanjeev Nasiar will argue this matter and not Sh. Dalip Rastogi.

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

Put up for arguments by Sh. Sanjeev Nasiar, advocate on **17.08.2026.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 356/24

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Kuldeep, Ld. counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the appellant as he is not prepared with the arguments today.

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

Put up for arguments on **19.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 679/24

10.04.2026

Present : Ms. Nikita Devi, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

None for the respondent.

Sh. Kuldeep, Id. counsel for the intervener.

None has appeared for the respondent despite repeated calls since morning. Fresh notice be issued to the MCD for ensuring the presence of the counsel on the next date of hearing.

Ld. counsel for the appellant sought some time to amend the appeal to challenge the sealing order instead of show cause notice.

At request, put up for arguments with connected appeal on **19.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 148/25

CK Mehra and Sons (HUF) Th. Its Karta Ajay Mehra Vs. NDMC

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Arnav Sethi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Laqshyaa Saluja, Ld. counsel for the respondent
along with Dharmbir Singh, Consultant, NDMC.

Arguments heard in respect of jurisdiction of this Tribunal to adjudicate this appeal in view of the order passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 11.04.2022 in W.P.(C) no. 4677/1985.

As per the status report filed by the NDMC on 05.05.2025, three properties no. B-17, B-18 and B-19 basement, Sagar Apartments, Tilak Marg, New Delhi were sealed on the directions of the Hon'ble Monitoring Committee appointed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and the appellant has already deposited an amount of Rs. 8,16,241/- on 30.12.2023 on account of penalty.

The other two properties no. B-18 and B-19 were directed to be desealed by the Hon'ble Monitoring Committee and the appellant is required to approach the Hon'ble Monitoring Committee to get the property desealed. Since, the sealing action against the subject property no. B-17, Sagar Apartment, was done at the instance of Hon'ble Monitoring Committee, this court does not have

.....contd.2

: 2 :

jurisdiction to adjudicate this appeal. The appellant is at liberty to approach the Appropriate Committee to deseal the property.

The 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
10.04.2026

A.No. 202/25

Amit Arora Vs. MCD

10.04.2026

Present : Ms. Ashi Nigam, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Varun Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

1. Arguments heard on the application seeking condonation of delay in filing the appeal which is against the impugned order dated 25.11.2022 seeking demolition of property No.C-5-D/98A, LIG Flats, Janakpuri, New Delhi.
2. As per appellant, the show cause notice dated 14.11.2022 was received and was duly replied but the demolition order dated 25.11.2022 was never received and came to the knowledge of the appellant only through status report filed by the MCD in some Civil Suit and thereafter this appeal has been filed on 07.04.2025 and the delay should be condoned.
3. Ld. counsel for the respondent on the other hand has argued that the appellant acknowledged receiving the demolition order in the letter at page No.12-C of the office record and it cannot be said that the demolition order was not received by the appellant.
4. I have perused the record. The show cause notice and the demolition order were issued in the name of

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

the father of the appellant Late Sh. Vinod Arora and not in the name of the appellant. Whether his father wrote the letter available at page 12-C or not cannot be decided as this stage. The appellant disputes this letter and in these facts the delay is condoned subject to cost of Rs. 5,000/- to be deposited with the Registry of this Court.

5. Put up for arguments on appeal on **21.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 284/25

10.04.2026

Present : Ms. Sana Ansari, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC along with Sh. I. Ahmad, Advocate along with appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.

Pass over sought by ld. counsel for the appellant for 2.00 pm, which is not possible due to heavy cause list.

One last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **16.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 299/25

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Manmohan Singh, Sh. Rajeev Kumar Bholra and Sh. M.C. Upreti, Ld counsels for the appellant along with appellant.
None for the respondent.
Sh. M.S.Bammi, Ld. counsel for the intervener along with intervener in person.

Arguments on the application u/s 5 of Limitation Act heard on behalf of the appellant.

None has appeared for the respondent despite repeated calls since morning and awaiting till 3.00 pm.

The delay is more than 9 years and assistance is required from the counsel for the MCD.

Fresh notice be issued to the MCD for ensuring the presence of the counsel on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further arguments on this application on **18.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 10/26 (M)
Sangeta Sharma and Ors. Vs. MCD

10.04.2026

Present : Sh. Manoj Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. Sunil Bansal, AE(B) and Sh. Shivender, JE.

This is an application seeking execution of the judgment dated 09.12.2025 directed to be complied within 6 weeks. The order was passed in the presence of Ld. counsel for the respondent. As per the applicant, the respondent did not take any steps after the order dated 09.12.2025 and thereafter issued a letter dated 25.03.2026 only after receiving notice of this application.

Ld. counsel for the respondent has stated that because of issue of minimum ROW being not available in front of the subject property, the same could not be regularized and the matter has now been referred to Town Planning Department.

Ld. counsel for the applicant however has drawn attention of the court to the order dated 17.11.2023 passed in this appeal wherein an adjoining property no. 133 has already been regularized abutting the same ROW. He has further relied upon the para 9 of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court passed in the case of MCD Vs. M/s Indian Potash Limited 2023 : DHC : 2727.

....contd.2

: 2 :

I have perused the record.

This court vide order dated 09.12.2025 directed the respondent to issue regularization certificate within 6 weeks from that order subject to completion of formalities, if any left out. The respondent till 25.03.2026 did not inform the appellant about any formality to be complied with by the appellant and issued a letter dated 25.03.2026 only after receiving the notice of this application. The respondent is bound to comply with the orders of this court unless challenged. Admittedly, there is no challenge to the order dated 09.12.2025 and more than 4 months have been passed since then. Infacts, show cause notice be issued to the Dy. Commissioner concerned to be served upon him through Commissioner of MCD with directions to the Dy. Commissioner to be present in the court in person with his explanation on the next date of hearing and to explain as to why the order dated 09.12.2025 has not been complied with and why coercive remedies provided under Order XXI CPC should not be initiated against the erring official.

Put up for further proceedings on 22.04.2026. A longer date has been given on the request of Id. counsel for the respondent.

...contd.3

: 3 :

A copy of this order be sent along with the notice to the
Dy. Commissioner, concerned.

Registry is directed to send the notice today itself.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 12/26 (M)

10.04.2026

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

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

Put up for consideration on this application on
22.05.2026.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.04.2026

A.No. 372/17, 373/17, 176/18, 636/18, 637/18, 638/18 & 17/24

10.04.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 372/17 & 373/17.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 176/18, 636/18, 637/18 & 638/18.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 17/24.
None for the respondent /HCC.

Vide separate common judgment of even date, all the aforesaid appeals are 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
10.04.2026