

A.No. 324/26
Randhir Singh Vs. MCD

23.04.2026

Fresh case received. It be checked and registered.

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

Submissions heard. File perused.

This is an appeal challenging an order dated 22.09.2025 passed by Ld. Addl. Senior Civil Judge, District North, Rohini, Delhi directing the MCD to demolish the unauthorized construction in the property of the appellant. An appeal against this order shall lie before the Ld. Principal District and Sessions Judge, North District, Rohini, Delhi and not before this Tribunal, where only the orders mentioned under Section 347-B DMC Act are appealable only.

This appeal is hereby dismissed being not maintainable before this Tribunal.

The appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 328/26

23.04.2026

Fresh case received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Harshit Bhardwaj, 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 **20.08.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. first floor of the property bearing no. F-54, Karampura, New Delhi-110015 in pursuance of the demolition order dated 07.04.2026. 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
23.04.2026

A.No. 329/26

23.04.2026

Fresh case received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Sohail Khan, 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 **11.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 407/23

23.04.2026

Present : None for the appellant.

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

The next date of hearing in the matter is 04.05.2026. The appeal is of the year 2023. In view of the heavy pendency, no early hearing is possible. The application is dismissed.

Put up on the date fixed i.e. **04.05.2026** for the purpose fixed.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 780/25

23.04.2026

Present : Ms. Ira Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC and Ms. Tanu, Advocate along with appellant in person.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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 go through the status report, to inspect the record and to argue the matter.

At request, put up for arguments 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
23.04.2026

A.No. 849/25

23.04.2026

Present : Ms. Annu Arora, Id. counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent. Fresh
Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

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 go through the
status report, to inspect the record and to argue the
matter.

At request, put up for arguments 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
23.04.2026

A.No. 232/26 & 216/26
Raj Bindu Charitable Trust Vs. MCD

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Naveen Grover, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Nitin Kumar, Ld. Proxy counsel for the intervener.

Arguments heard in the aforesaid appeals. Record perused.

The appellant has disputed the service of show cause notice passed under Sections 344 (1) and 343 of DMC Act dated 22.07.2025 in appeal no. 232/26 and the service of show cause notice passed under Section 345-A DMC Act dated 10.09.2025 in appeal no. 216/26.

I have perused the record.

These two show cause notices are reported to be served through pasting at the subject property i.e. Swiss Cottage School, Bijwasan, New Delhi as well as by speed post.

There are no photographs of pasting nor there are any witnesses to the pasting nor the name of the appellant is mentioned in any of the show cause notice. The onus is on the respondent to show that the show cause notices were duly served. The respondent has violated its own circulars reproduced below, which provides the formalities to be complied while serving the notice through pasting and speed post.

....contd.2

: 2 :

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.

...contd.3

: 3 :

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 these facts, the impugned demolition order dated 13.08.2025 and sealing order dated 16.12.2025 are set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply and documents to be submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant.

...contd.4

: 4 :

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 11.05.2026 at 2.00 pm qua demolition order and at 3.00 pm qua sealing order and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

The aforesaid appeals are allowed and 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
23.04.2026

A.No. 281/26

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Kritika Khrab, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Record has already been produced.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh Ikrant Sharma is not available today due to some persons difficulty. In the interest of justice one more opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter.

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

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 297/26

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. D.K. Sharma and Ms. Nitasha Gupta, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Paras Agarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Rohit Bhati, ALO, MCD.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

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

Appellant has moved an application for interim protection till his regularization application is considered. The affidavits filed along with the application are without attestation. Let the proper affidavits be filed. Further, the documents filed with the application show that the appellant has applied for regularization physically without the requisite documents/annexures. This regularization application is not a proper application which otherwise is to be applied through online portal of MCD.

On request, put up for arguments on the appeal on **10.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 446/14
23.04.2026

Present :

Sh. Ankur Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An application has been filed by the appellant seeking compliance of the order dated 31.05.2024 vide which the respondent was directed to decide the regularization application of the appellant before the next date of hearing which was 06.09.2024.

As per the status report dated 17.12.2025, that application is still pending being forwarded to the Town Planning Department of MCD, for comments and opinion and today, Id. counsel for the respondent has informed that a letter has been issued to appellant yesterday i.e. 22.04.2026 which as per the appellant, has not been served upon him. Let the soft copy of this letter be supplied to the counsel for the appellant today itself and the appellant is required to comply with this letter.

Let the further status report be filed in respect of regularization application of the appellant on the next date of hearing.

Put up for awaiting the status report and arguments on **02.06.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 155/16 & 980/16
Navdeep Gupta Vs. MCD

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

1. Arguments heard at length. File perused.
2. These are two appeals challenging the two demolition orders dated 18.12.2015 in appeal no. 155/16 and dated 21.10.2015 in appeal no. 980/16 passed in respect of unauthorized construction in the shape of additions/alterations and removal of load bearing walls at basement and ground floor vide order dated 18.12.2015 and unauthorized construction in shape of entire first and second floor vide order dated 21.10.2015, in respect of property No. B-11, Mahendru Enclave, Delhi.
3. The appellant has challenged these orders on the grounds that order dated 18.12.2015 does not specify as to which load bearing walls at basement and ground floor has been removed nor specify the additions and alterations alleged to be made in the property and because the order is non-specific of these details, the same is liable to be set-aside. In respect of the order dated 21.10.2025 it was argued that despite initial booking dated 01.05.2015 being

... Contd... 2/-

: 2 :

specifically in the name of the appellant, the new show cause notice dated 14.10.2015 was issued in the name of owner/builder and was served on some unknown person Mr. Ram Babu and Pramod and therefore the same is liable to be set-aside for violation of principles of natural justice.

4. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the show cause notice dated 01.05.2015 was duly served on the appellant and his reply was considered and personal hearing was given to him and thereafter the order dated 18.12.2015 was passed. The show cause notice dated 01.05.2015 clearly shows the walls and pillars which have been removed by the appellant and there is no dispute about the identification of the unauthorized construction. In the other appeal the challenging the demolition order dated 21.10.2015, it was argued that the show cause notice and the demolition order were duly served upon the guard present at the premises and was duly served upon the appellant. The appellant demolished existing first and second floor and raised fresh construction on these floors and therefore this appeal has no merits.
5. I have perused the record. Admittedly, the first show cause notice dated 01.05.2015 booking unauthorized

...Contd...3/-

: 3 :

construction of additions/alterations and removal of load bearing walls at basement and ground floor was issued in the name of the appellant which was duly replied. The demolition order dated 18.12.2015 was also passed in his name. Once the respondent was aware about the name of the appellant as on 01.05.2015, there was no reason to not to issue the second show cause notice dated 14.10.2015 in his name. This second show cause notice booking unauthorized construction of entire first and second floor was issued in the name of owner/builder. There is no explanation for doing the same.

6. Further, the first booking does not clarified as to which load bearing wall was removed at the ground floor and first floor. The respondent was asked to clarify the same during these appeals vide order dated 05.06.2024 and thereafter the status report dated 22.10.2024 was filed in which in para 5, it was stated that there no proof which may show that what unauthorized construction was carried out and which load bearing wall was removed and except the record filed in these appeals, there is no other record to identify the load bearing wall stated to be removed in the show cause notice dated 01.05.2015.

...Contd..4/-

: 4 :

7. In these facts, the demolition order dated 18.12.2015 passed in pursuance to the show cause notice dated 01.05.2015 in respect of unauthorized construction in the shape of additions/alterations and removal of load bearing walls at basement and ground floor is liable to be set-aside for want of specific details. The appeal No. 155/16 is allowed and the demolition order dated 18.12.2015 is set-aside.
8. Coming to appeal no. 980/16 challenging the demolition order dated 21.10.2015. The show cause notice dated 14.10.2015 was issued in the name of owner/builder despite the respondent having knowing about the correct name of the appellant. Further, the show cause notice was served upon one Ram Babu and demolition order dated 21.10.2015 was served upon one Pramod. There is no office noting as to how Mr. Ram Babu and Mr. Pramod are related to the property or to the appellant. The service of show cause notice dated 14.10.2015 is doubtful and since the same is not shown to be properly served, the appeal is allowed and the demolition order dated 21.10.2015 is set-aside with directions to the respondent to pass a speaking order after considering the reply and documents to be submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the

...Contd...5/-

: 5 :

appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on **12.05.2026 at 2.00 pm** and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

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
23.04.2026

A.No. 521/17
Vikas Gupta Vs. MCD

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Sunil Gupta and Sh. Harish Gupta, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

Arguments heard at length.

There is a delay of about 2 years in filing this appeal and the appellant claims that he came to know about this demolition order dated 10.09.2015 only when the vacation notice dated 22.05.2017 was received. This appeal was filed on 17.07.2017. In these facts, the delay in filing the appeal is condoned.

The appellant has disputed the service of the show cause notice dated 28.08.2015 stated to be served on the appellant himself.

As per the show cause notice at page 3/C of the appeal, the same was received by the appellant on 02.09.2015. The appellant has disputed his signatures and has placed on record the copy of his driving license to show his genuine signatures.

Ld. counsel for the respondent however has stated that the appellant himself received the notice and now is deliberately disputing his signatures on the show cause notice.

...contd.2

: 2 :

I have perused the record.

The receiving of the show cause notice by the appellant is doubtful for two reasons. The first being that the correct name of the appellant is Vikas Gupta and now Vikash Gupta. The person who receiving the show cause notice wrote his name as Vikash. Had it being received by the appellant himself, he would have written his correct name as Vikas while receiving the show cause notice and not in the wrong name mentioned in the show cause notice itself.

Secondly, the signatures of the appellant on his driving license which were appended in the year 2017 show that they are altogether different from the signatures on the show cause notice dated 28.08.2015.

It is also relevant to note that the concerned JE was called to the court to confirm as to who received and signed the show cause notice dated 28.08.2015 and the said JE on 29.05.2024 stated that he cannot say whether he obtained the signatures of the appellant or of some other person on the show cause notice.

In these facts, since the service of the show cause notice is disputed and doubtful, the appeal is allowed and the the matter is remanded back with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering

...contd.3

: 3 :

the reply and documents to be submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 11.05.2026 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
23.04.2026

A.No. 555/18

23.04.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. R.K. Kashyap, Ld counsel for the respondent through
VC.

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

The appeal pertains to the year 2018. 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 **05.06.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 98/19
23.04.2026
Present :

Appellant no. 3 in person.
None for the appellant no. 1 and 2.
None for the respondent/MCD.
Sh. Mahipal Singh, Ld. counsel for the Intervener along
with intervener Sh. Rajender Singh Tanwar, in person.

It is stated by the appellant no. 3 that the possession of
the property has already been taken over by the bank for
non-payment of the loan and she does not want to pursue
this appeal.

Statement of appellant no. 3 recorded separately to this
effect.

The appeal is dismissed as withdrawn as far as the
appellant no. 3 is concerned.

None has appeared for the appellant no. 1 and 2 despite
repeated calls since morning.

The appeal pertains to the year 2019. In the interest of
justice, one last and final opportunity is granted to the
appellant no. 1 and 2 to address the arguments in the
matter on the next date of hearing.

None has also 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.

Put up for arguments on **11.06.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD/23.04.2026

A.No. 848/19 &, 94/20

23.04.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Ms. Praveen Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent
through VC.

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

However, in the interest of justice, one last and final
opportunity is granted to the appellant to advance
arguments in the aforesaid appeals subject to cost of Rs.
2,000/- in each appeal to be deposited with Registry of
this Tribunal, on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **30.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 117/20

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Anil Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant along with Sh. Bansi Lal Sharma, AR of the appellant bank.
Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, proxy counsel for Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent.
Sh. Anupam Sharma, Ld. counsel for the DDA through VC.

Fresh Vakalatnama filed on behalf of the appellant, same is taken on record.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to inspect the record and to argue the matter as he has recently been engaged.

At request, put up for arguments 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
23.04.2026

A.No. 147/20 & 148/20

23.04.2026

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders on **26.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 22/22

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

It is stated by the Id. counsel for the appellant that the counsel for the respondent has informed him that he is held up before the Hon'ble High Court.

Infacts, put up for arguments 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
23.04.2026

A.No. 154/23

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Ravi Joshi and Deepak Joshi, Id. counsels for the appellant.

Sh. Mohit Sharma, counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that he has instructions from the appellant to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

However, perusal of the record shows that vakalatnama of the counsel is not on record.

Ld. counsel seeks some time to file the vakalatnama and to make statement regarding withdrawal of the aforesaid appeal.

At request, put up for recording the statement qua withdrawal of the appeal on **29.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 178/23
Smt. Raj Gupta Vs., MCD

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Ravi Joshi and Sh. Deepak Joshi, Id. counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Sanjeet Kumar, proxy counsel for Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that he has instructions from the appellant to withdraw the aforesaid appeal and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeals.

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

In view of the statement made by the Id. counsel for the appellant, the aforesaid appeal stands disposed off as withdrawn.

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
23.04.2026

A.No. 395/23, 401/23 & 402/23

23.04.2026

Present : Appellant Deepak Manmohan (who is also an advocate) in person in appeal no. 395/23 and he is also counsel in appeal no. 401/23 and proxy counsel in appeal no. 402/23. Sh. Anupam Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

Status report was sought from the SDM, Alipur in terms of the order dated 24.01.2025. The notice was received back served for 26.03.2025, but none appeared nor any report was filed. A fresh notice was issued to SDM for 29.07.2025, but despite service, no report was filed for 25.11.2025 and fresh notice was issued on 26.11.2025 for today since 25.11.2025 was declared a holiday.

Notice has been duly served on SDM, Alipur thrice, but none has appeared for him nor any report has been filed. Infacts, issue B/W in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- against the SDM, Alipur through SHO Alipur with directions to the SDM to be present in person with report as per the order dated 24.01.2025, for the next date of hearing.

The copy of the order dated 24.01.2025 be also annexed with the bail-able warrants for compliance.

Put up for further proceedings on **05.06.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 586/23

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Suhail Pasha, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Previous cost has now been deposited.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh.M.S. Khan is held up before the Hon'ble High Court. Same is opposed.

Record shows that appellant has sought adjournments on the ground of non-availability of the counsel on 09.02.2024, 09.10.2024, 11.02.2025, 02.06.2025, 20.11.2025 and now today and since more than two years, the matter has been adjourned only because of the non-availability of the main counsel.

Though, there is no ground for adjournment, however, In the interest of justice one more last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter subject to cost of Rs. 10,000/- to be deposited with the Registry.

Put up for arguments on **11.06.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 61/24 & 62/24

23.04.2026

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

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

However, in the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to advance arguments in the aforesaid appeals subject to cost of Rs. 5,000/- in each appeal to be deposited with Registry of this Tribunal, on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **11.09.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 252/24

23.04.2026

Present : Appellant in person.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Surender Mishra is held up before the Hon'ble High Court.

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 **07.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 427/24

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Jugal Wadhwa, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC along with Sh. Raghav Goyal, Adv. in person.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Asit Tiwari and Sh. Sonu Chaudhary, Ld. counsels for the intervener along with intervener.

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

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks adjournment on the ground of his illness. Same is not opposed.

Ld. counsel for the respondent/MCD has argued the matter.

At request, put up for reply and arguments on the application under Order I rule 10 CPC and appeal on **22.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

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

23.04.2026

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

Further arguments on behalf of the respondent/MCD and intervener heard.

Arguments in rebuttal also heard.

Put up for orders on **28.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 609/24

23.04.2026

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

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as he is not ready with the arguments

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

At request, put up for arguments on **01.09.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 150/25

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Hardik Saxena, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as daughter of main counsel Sh. Vishal Bansal is hospitalized.

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 **01.09.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 179/25

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Pankaj Aggarwal, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant through VC along with appellant in person.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as there is engagement ceremony of niece of main counsel.

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 **02.09.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 495/25
Sheetal Vs. MCD

23.04.2026

Present : Appellant in person.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

It is stated by the appellant that the possession of the property has already been taken over by the bank for non-payment of the loan and she does not want to pursue this appeal and she may be permitted to withdraw the appeal.

Statement of appellant recorded separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by the appellant, the aforesaid appeal is disposed off as withdrawn.

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
23.04.2026

A.No. 697/25 & 698/25

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Himanshu Sihag, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought by ld. counsel for the appellant as he has matter before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

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 **10.06.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 122/26

23.04.2026

Present : Sh. Jatin Arora and Sh. Aryan Sangwan, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Id. counsel for the respondents no. 2 to 7 along with some of the respondents.

Arguments heard on the interim application and application under Order XXVI rule 9 CPC

Put up for orders on the said applications on **24.04.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 136/26

23.04.2026

Present : Ms. Vani Garg, Ld counsel for the appellant along with Ms. Gunjan, Advocate.
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Lokesh Yadav, Veterinary Office, MCD, West Zone.

Reply filed by the respondent to the appeal. copy supplied.

Record has been produced.

I have perused the record. There is no sealing order passed under Section 345-A DMC Act.

This appeal has been filed under Section 347-B of DMC Act. Since, there is no order passed under Section 345-A DMC Act, this appeal is not maintainable.

Let the appellant to clarify as to how this appeal is maintainable on the next date of hearing.

At request, put up for arguments on the maintainability of the appeal on **03.06.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
23.04.2026

A.No. 3/25, 11/25 & 12/25

23.04.2026

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

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
23.04.2026