

A.No. 375/26

07.05.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. A.K. Sharma , 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 **11.05.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. property no. H-24, Gali no. 2, Kh. No. 1, Shastri Park, Delhi-53, in pursuance of the demolition order dated 27.04.2026. 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
07.05.2026

A.No. 376/26
Punita Verma and Ors. Vs. MCD

07.05.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Deepika and Ms. Sonalika Verma, Ld counsels for
the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The aforesaid appeal is against the show cause notice dated 17.03.2026, 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
07.05.2026

A.No. 380/26

07.05.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Ramesh Kumar and Sh. Rajinder Pal Singh, 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 **01.06.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 383/26, 384/26 and 385/26

07.05.2026

Fresh appeals received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Dushyant Bhargava, Sh. Ishank Bedwal and Sh. Nitish Gaur, Ld. counsels for the appellant along with appellant Md. Noor Alam and Md. Aftab in person.

Submissions heard. File perused.

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

The Executive Engineer (B) is directed to ensure the presence of the concerned AE(B), who shall appear in person along with the record of the proceedings, status report and reply on next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **19.05.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 818/25

07.05.2026

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

Reply to the application under Section 5 of Limitation Act filed on behalf of the respondent. Copy supplied.

Time sought by the respondent to produce the record. Let the record be produced and can be inspected by the Id. counsel for the appellant.

Put up for arguments on this application seeking condonation of delay in filing the appeal, 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
07.05.2026

A.No. 10/26 (M)

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Manoj Kumar and Sh. Anubhav Chandel, Ld counsel for the appellant along with husband of the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Id. counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Sunil Chauhan, AE(B), in person.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Appellant is directed to comply with the requirements as mentioned in the status report and the Invalid notice dated 06.05.2026 within 10 days from today and thereafter, the regularization application be processed and fresh status report be called in this regard.

Put up for awaiting the fresh status report on **29.05.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 111/26

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Deepak Grover and Sh. Sandeep Sharma, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC and Sh. Vaibhav Sanwal, Adv. in person along with Sh. Manoj Kumar, AE(B).

Status report with photographs 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 **14.09.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 229/17, 230/17, 231/17, 232/17, 373/23, 374/23, 375/23 & 376/23

07.05.2026

Present :

Sh. Hemant Sharma, Ld counsels for the appellant through VC in appeal no. 230/17, 231/17, 374/23 & 376/23.

Ms. Shipra Bhuttan, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellants in other appeals along with appellant Sh. Krishan Kumar and Sh. Mahesh Kumar in person.

Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 229/17 and 230/17.

Ms. Kanta Chaudhary, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 231/17 and 232/17.

Ms. Praveen Sharma, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 230/17 joined through VC.

Sh. Vijay Tyagi, Ld. counsel for the MCD Advocate for MCD in Appeal no. 373/2023 to 376/2023 joined through VC.

Ld. counsel for the appellants in appeal no. 230/17, 231/17, 374/23 & 376/23 submits that he has recently been engaged in the matter and he needs some time to inspect the record.

Ld. proxy counsel for the other appellants also requests for adjournment.

Same is strongly opposed.

The appeal pertains to the year 2017/2023. In the interest of justice one last and final opportunity is granted to the appellants to address the arguments in the matter.

Put up for arguments on **08.06.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 705/17

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Vimal Dhingra and Sh. Gourav Kumar, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Jai Gupta, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent.
Intervener Kavita Grover in person.

Some more time sought on behalf of the respondent to produce the record of the earlier booking of the first and second floor in the year 2006.

Let the record be submitted on or before the next date of hearing.

Put up for further arguments on **24.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 906/18

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ranjeet Pandey, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the respondent as he is not carrying the case file with him.

The appeal pertains to the year 2018. However, 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 **18.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 27/19

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Uzair Elahi, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further arguments on **01.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 519/19, 520/19, 521/19, 522/19, 523/19, 6/20, 7/20, 8/20, 9/20 & 10/20

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Vishesh Issar and Sh. Vardan, Ld counsels for the appellant.

Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC in appeals no. 6/20, 7/20, 8/20, 9/20 & 10/20 through VC along with Sh. Adarsh Lohia, Ld. proxy counsel present in the court.

Sh. Ravi Bhushan Sharma, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 519/19, 520/19, 521/19, 522/19, 523/19 through VC along with Sh. Atul Goswami, advocate present in the court.

Sh. Ankit Verma, LAC, for the proposed intervener Ms. Neera Sharma. Authority letters filed.

Ld. counsel for the proposed intervener seeks permission to inspect the record. Same cannot be allowed as the intervener is yet to be impleaded in the matter.

Part arguments heard.

At request, put up for further arguments on **03.07.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 231/22, 275/22, 256/24 & 257/24

07.05.2026

Present : Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Puneet Goyal, Ld. counsel for the intervener along
with Sh. Sunny Taneja, son of the intervener Ashok
Kumar.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as
main counsel Sh. Dalip Rastogi is held up in some other
court.

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

Put up for arguments on **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
07.05.2026

A.No. 514/23
Maher Chand and Anr. Vs. MCD

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Mohit Gupta and Sh. Mohit Jangra, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Ranjeet Pandey, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Mr. Mohit Kalra, JE(B), Shahdara, South Zone.
Ms. Diya Jain, Ld. Proxy counsel for Ms. Jaya Goyal, counsel for the intervener and Ms. Manpreet Kaur, Advocate joined through VC.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied. As per the status report, the appellants have not yet filed any fresh application for regularization after order dated 04.07.2025.

Arguments heard at length.

This is an appeal challenging the rejection letter dated 21.04.2023 by which the application of the appellants seeking regularization of the existing structure at property no. 9/5261, out of khasra no. 604/301, Village Seelampur, Delhi-110031 was rejected. The regularization application was rejected since court case regarding title of the property was pending.

This court had recorded the submissions of the appellant in the order dated 04.07.2025 that the title in respect of the property has been cleared by the Civil Court in favour of the appellant and there is no stay to that order by the Appellate Court.

...contd.2

: 2 :

It was stated for the appellants that considering the fact that the first court has cleared the title of the property in question, the rejection order is no longer sustainable as the dispute regarding title of the property is now settled and therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

Ld. counsel for the respondent on the other hand has submitted that at the time of rejecting the regularization application, the dispute qua the title was subjudice and same was rightly rejected and therefore, there is no infirmity in the impugned rejection letter.

Ld. counsel for the intervener on the other hand has argued that the suit was rejected under Order VII rule 11 CPC on technical ground and was not dismissed on merits and further an appeal against the rejection order by the Civil Court, is pending and therefore, the title of the appellant is still disputed.

I have perused the record.

The only reason for rejection of the regularization application was Civil Suit pending between the parties regarding the title of the subject property. That suit has now been decided, may be on the technical grounds, but there is an order rejecting the suit challenging the title of the appellant. However, as on date of rejection of the regularization application, the respondent/MCD was right

....contd.3

: 3 :

in rejecting the regularization application since regularization can be accorded only to the true owner of the property. If the appellants have now clear title of the property, they are at liberty to apply afresh by furnishing an indemnity bond to the effect that they shall not claim any right, title or interest in the property only on the basis of regularization and the respondent shall be at liberty to revoke the regularization as and when it is held that the appellants do not have any title in the property. Subject to this indemnity bond being accepted, the respondent is required to consider the regularization application on its own merits.

In view of the aforesaid findings, the appeal is dismissed with liberty to the appellant to apply afresh for regularization.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 734/23
Chandra Shekhar Vs. MCD

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Ranbir Singh, Ld. counsels for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Vijay Tyagi, Ld. counsel for the respondent joined through VC.
Sh. Sudhir Gupta and Ms. Darshika Tiwari, Ld counsels for the intervener along with intervener.

Arguments heard on this appeal. Record perused.

It is the contention of the appellant that neither his reply was considered nor opportunity of being heard was provided.

I have perused the record. The show cause notice dated 14.09.2023 was booked at post office on 16.09.2023 and was delivered on 18.09.2023 as per track consignment record at page 3/C of the record. The reply was filed by the appellant on 20.09.2023 which is at page no. 49/C of the record and thereafter the demolition order dated 25.09.2023 was passed.

Though, the time of three days provided to reply the show cause notice as mentioned in the show cause notice in itself is insufficient, otherwise also, the period of three days has to be calculated from the date of service of show cause notice and not the date mentioned on the show cause notice. It was served on 18.09.2023 and

....contd.2

: 2 :

was duly replied within 3 days on 20.09.2023 as contemplated in the show cause notice. Yet this reply was not considered nor the personal hearing was given to the appellant nor speaking order was passed as to why the contentions raised in the reply were rejected by the respondent.

In these facts, the demolition order dated 25.09.2023 is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply dated 20.09.2023 submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant.

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 25.05.2026 at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

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
07.05.2026

A.No. 3/24 & 402/24

07.05.2026

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

The record of revocation file 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 **15.09.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 25/24, 75/24 & 76/24

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Jai Gupta, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 25/24.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal nos. 75/24 & 76/24.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent in appeal no. 25/24 as main counsel Sh. Ashutosh Gupta is held up before the Hon'ble High Court.

At request, put up for arguments on **16.09.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 558/14

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Tarun Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent
joined through VC.

Part arguments heard.

The matter in respect of the subject property is also
subjudice before the Hon'ble High Court in a writ petition
listed in October 2026.

Infacts, put up for further arguments on **06.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 51/25

07.05.2026

Present : Ms. Fozia Malik, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent through VC along with Sh. Adarsh Kumar Lohia, Advocate in person.

Part arguments heard.

Ld counsel for the appellant seeks some time to file documents to the effect that the second and third floor of the premises are protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

At request, put up for further 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
07.05.2026

A.No. 102/25

07.05.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent.

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

The appellant is given one last and final opportunity to address arguments 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
07.05.2026

A.No. 414/25

07.05.2026

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

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

The appellant is given one last and final opportunity to
address arguments on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **17.09.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 454/25
Anoop Singh Vs. MCD

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Manjit Kumar Pathak, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that he has instructions from the appellants to withdraw the aforesaid appeal with liberty to file fresh appeal/case and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeal.

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 is disposed off as withdrawn with the liberty as prayed for subject to law of limitation.

Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 609/25

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. O.P. Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellants.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

1. Arguments heard on the interim application.
2. This is an appeal against the demolition order dated 19.08.2025 vide which the respondent directed to demolish/remove the projections on the front and back side at ground, first and second floor and projections on the front side at third floor along with tin shed portion measuring 27.30 sq. mtrs. at first floor and constructed 128.18 sq. mtr. at third floor being not protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 in property no. WZ-11, Manohar Park, East Punjabi Bagh, Delhi.
3. It was argued for the appellant that the construction of the entire property is old and occupied and protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011, yet the respondent because of personal vendetta against the appellant because of complaints against the AE concerned, did not consider the documents of the appellant and passed the impugned demolition order which should be stayed till the disposal of this appeal.

...Contd..2/-

: 2 :

4. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that all the documents of the appellants were considered by the Quasi Judicial Authority and protection was also granted for the construction which is prior to 08.02.2007. The appellant could not furnish any document to show that the construction of the portion directed to be demolished is prior to 08.02.2007 and therefore, there is no prime facie case in favour of appellants.
5. I have perused the record.
6. The respondent booked the unauthorized construction in this property vide show cause notice dated 22.11.2024 on the basis a court case and recorded in the show cause notice that the construction is old and occupied. The construction which was booked through this show cause notice was unauthorized construction of entire basement to second floor and part third floor on the service side road. There was no booking of the projections on municipal land from ground to third floor for which demolition order has been passed. The appellant was never put to show cause in respect of the projections on the municipal land. The show cause notice was duly replied by the appellants and thereafter the demolition order was passed after considering the property tax return, in respect of the

...Contd..3/-

: 3 :

projections from ground to third floor and a tin shed of 27.30 sq. mtr., at first floor and 128.18 sq. mtr. construction at third floor.

7. The appellant in support of their case have relied upon the house tax record to show that the construction is old and occupied and also upon an order dated 07.09.2022 passed by the Monitoring Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India wherein the MCD through the then AE stated that the construction from basement to third floor is old and occupied.
8. The Id counsel for the respondent has stated that this order of this Monitoring Committee cannot be relied upon as the Monitoring Committee was concerned only in respect of misuse of three shops at the ground floor and not in respect of the construction in the property.
9. At this stage of deciding interim application, only prime facie case, balance of convenience and irreparable loss and injury has to be seen. Admittedly, the Monitoring Committee was seized of the matter in respect of misuse at three shops at the ground floor of this property in 2022. As per status report filed by MCD before the Monitoring Committee, the premises consisted of basement to third floor. The same

...Contd..4/-

: 4 :

show that the third floor was in existence at least in the year 2022 but there was no booking of unauthorized construction by respondent in 2022 or prior thereto. Further, the Monitoring Committee after considering the house tax record and physical appearance of the building, comprehended that the property is old and covered under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. This show that there is prime facie in favour of the appellant as not only this unauthorized construction was not booked in 2022 or earlier but also that the show cause notice itself mentions that it is old and occupied. There was no ongoing construction at the time booking.

10. The Quasi Judicial Authority in the impugned demolition order noted that as per inspection at first floor there is a tin shed of 35.81 sq. mtr., yet in the demolition order directed to demolish only 27.30 sq. mtr., of this tin shed and protected 8.51 sq. mtr. It cannot be believed that this 8.51 sq. mtr., tin shed was constructed prior to 08.02.2007 and remaining 27.30 sq. mtr, which has been directed to be demolished was construction after 08.02.2007. There was no material with respondent to give protection even to this 8.51 sq. mtr., tin shed. The Quasi Judicial

...Contd..5/-

: 5 :

Authority in this regard, relied upon the house tax record which reflected 71.71 sq. mtr., at the first floor being shown in the property tax return but admittedly this 71.71 sq. mtr., shown in the property tax return of 2004-05 is pucca construction and not tin shed as believed by the respondent.

11. Further, as already recorded, the projections on municipal land on all floors were never booked but were directed to be demolished in the impugned order. The respondent cannot travel beyond the show cause notice. Further the photographs available in the office record do not reflect that these projections at ground, mezzanine, first and second floor were constructed later on and were not raised simultaneously when the floor was constructed.
12. In these facts, there is a prime facie in favour of the appellant and they shall also suffer irreparable loss and injury if the interim protection is not granted till disposal of the appeal. The balance of the convenience is also in their favour as the impugned booking itself record that the construction is old and occupied.
13. In these facts, the interim application is allowed and the operation of the impugned demolition order dated 19.08.2025 is stayed till disposal of this appeal.

...Contd..6/-

: 6 :

14. Nothing said hereinabove shall tantamount to have any expression on the merits of this case.

15. Put up for arguments on appeal on **07.08.2026**, the date already fixed. No adjournment shall be allowed on the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 299/26

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Piyush Saraf, Ld counsel for the appellant. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

An application seeking adjournment filed. Heard and perused. In view of the reason given in the application, the application is allowed and the matter is adjourned.

At request, put up for the arguments on the maintainability of the appeal on **02.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 367/26

07.05.2026

Case file is taken up today on an application for correction of typographical/clerical error in the order dated 06.05.2026 filed on behalf of the appellant.

Present : Sh. Anil Kumar Bhargav, Ld counsel for the appellant/applicant.

Heard on the application. File perused.

It is submitted by the ld. counsel for the appellant/applicant that address of the property was wrongly mentioned as B-318 instead of B-3/18 in the order dated 06.05.2026.

Demolition order and appeal perused.

Submissions made by the ld. counsel for the appellant are found correct. Hence, the application is allowed and now the address of the property be read as B-3/18 instead of B-318 in the order dated 06.05.2026.

The application stands disposed of.

Put up on the date fixed for the purpose fixed.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
07.05.2026

A.No. 385/20 & 560/24
DSIDC Friends CGHS Ltd. vs. MCD

07.05.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 385/2020.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 560/24.
Sh. Kautilya Kaushik and Ms. Ankita Wadhwa, Ld.
counsel for the intervener Sh. Prabhu Nath. Fresh
Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the aforesaid both
appeals stand 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
07.05.2026