

A.No. 615/26

22.07.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Ritim Mangla, 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 **29.07.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 618/26 & 619/26

22.07.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Kuldeep Singh Grewal, 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 **07.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 625/26

22.07.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Gaurav Tyagi and Sh. Amit Tyagi, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The aforesaid appeal is against the show cause notice, which is not appealable and maintainable before this Tribunal.

Issue notice to the respondent/MCD only to the limited aspect of filing the demolition/sealing order, if any passed against the property no. A-25 (Part), Rama Park, Veer Bazar Road, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi-110059, for on **07.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 626/26 : Chirag Sethi and Others Vs. MCD
A.No. 627/26 : Veena Sethi Vs. MCD
A.No. 628/26 : Kamal Kumar Handa Vs. MCD
A.No. 629/26 : Darshan Lal and Another Vs. MCD

22.07.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellants.

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 **09.09.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the properties of appellants in pursuance of the impugned order(s). This interim order shall not come in the way of any order/directions passed by the Hon'ble High Court as well as Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. It is also 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
22.07.2026

A.No. 631/26

M/s PE Communications Private Limited vs. MCD

22.07.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Sanjeev Bindal, 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 **12.10.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. property no. E-7, Block B-1, Mohan Co-operative Industrial Estate, Mathura Road, Delhi in pursuance of the demolition order dated 02.07.2026.

This interim order shall not come in the way of any order/directions passed by the Hon'ble High Court as well as Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. It is also 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

22.07.2026

A.No. 634/26
Kamlesh Vs. MCD

22.07.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Dilpreet Kaur, 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 **16.10.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. House no. 245, Village Navada, Uttam Nagar, Delhi, in pursuance of the demolition order dated 13.07.2026. This interim order shall not come in the way of any order/directions passed by the Hon'ble High Court as well as Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. It is also 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
22.07.2026

A.No. 683/25

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Jamshed Mirza, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Sagar Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC.

Ld. counsel for the respondent seeks some more time to ascertain as to which department of the MCD or any other Govt. Agency has taken action against the subject property and to file status report in this regard.

Put up for awaiting the status report in this regard on **05.08.2026.**

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 596/26
Lakshmi Pandey Vs. MCD

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Shashank Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The record has been produced. It be deposited with Registry. It can be inspected by the counsel for the appellant.

The appellant disputes the service of the show cause notice stating that she is the owner/occupier of the second floor of property no. D-248. The respondent claims that the show cause notice was served through pasting at the door of the property and the photographs of the same are available at page 6-C of the office record. The appellant claims that this affixation is not at the property.

Let the MCD to conduct fresh inspection tomorrow i.e 23.07.2026 at 2.00 pm and to file the status report with photographs of the entrance gate of the first floor and second floor of D-248, Karampura, Delhi, on the next date of hearing.

Put up for awaiting the status report and arguments on **01.09.2026.**

...contd.2

: 2 :

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. second floor of D-248, Karampura, Delhi, in pursuance of the impugned order. This interim order shall not come in the way of any order/directions passed by the Hon'ble High Court as well as Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. It is also 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
22.07.2026

A.No. 839/23

22.07.2026

Present : Ms. Deeksha, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Documents along with list of documents filed on behalf of the appellant. Copy supplied. Without prejudice to the rights of the respondent, the documents are taken on record.

Part arguments heard. Record perused.

The property tax self-assessment for the year 2021-22 shows covered area of 60 sq.mtrs each from ground to third floor and the age factor has been mentioned as 2009.

The respondent is directed to physically inspect the property and to file the status report in respect of existing covered area at each floor of the property including fourth floor as well, on the next date of hearing.

Let the physical inspection be conducted in the presence of the appellant on 29.07.2026 at 3.00 pm.

Put up for awaiting status report and arguments on **23.09.2026.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 39/16

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. B.K. Pandey, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Dharmvir Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

As per the status report, the regularization application of the appellant has been rejected on 20.07.2026 for non-compliance of Invalid notice dated 30.04.2026.

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

The appeal pertains to the year 2016. However, in the interest of justice one last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter on the next date of hearing.

At request, put up for arguments on **21.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 100/17 & 281/18

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 100/17.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal and Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsels for the respondent in appeal no. 281/18
Sh. Sachin Goel, Arch. Asstt., Town Planning Deptt., MCD

It is stated on behalf of the ATP that the Chairperson of the Standing Committee is yet to be elected and the nominations of the election have been filed yesterday only and the election is likely to be held on 29.07.2026.

At request, be awaited for the report of the outcome of the Standing Committee Meeting as per the last order, on **25.08.2026.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 47/18

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Diwanshu Sehgal, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC along with one intern Sh. Amzad.
Ms. Simran Auluck, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC along with Ms. Eesha Goel, Adv.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied to the Intern.

As per the status report, the physical inspection of the site, to be regularized, is scheduled for 28.07.2026 at 2.00 pm.

Infacts, be awaited for further status report 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
22.07.2026

A.No. 102/18
Vidyawanti Gambhir Vs. MCD

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Kunal Kalra, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

None is appeared for the respondent despite waiting and calls till 2.15 pm.

This is an appeal of 2018. In facts arguments heard.

1. The appellant in this appeal has challenged the revocation order dated 05.01.2018 vide which the sanctioned building plan dated 15.11.2016 obtained by the appellant under 'Saral Scheme' was revoked on the ground that the appellant misrepresented the facts in the application seeking sanctioned building plan and therefore the plan was revoked.
2. The appellant has challenged this revocation order on the ground that due to inadvertent mistake the property was mentioned as plot in the application whereas in the design and specification and the proposed plan submitted with the application it was mentioned that the property is constructed upto stilt and ground floor and sanctioned was needed only to built the upper floors and therefore the revocation order should be set-aside.

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

3. It was argued for the appellant that this Tribunal vide order dated 21.12.2026 passed in appeal no. 746/16 preferred by the appellant against the demolition order dated 02.01.2015 has specified that once the respondent has passed the sanctioned building plan, the respondent cannot take the objection that the same has been passed with concealment of facts before this Tribunal.
4. It was argued that in view of this observation of the Tribunal, the sanctioned building plan cannot be revoked and the appellant has already demolished the deviations and excess coverage as per her undertaking dated 21.12.2016.
5. None appeared for the respondent.
6. I have perused the record. The appellant obtained sanctioned building plan dated 15.11.2016 under 'Saral Scheme' in respect of the subject property bearing no. 280/31, Dhakka Johar, near Bhai Parmanand Colony, Delhi-110009. While applying for this plan, the appellant mentioned the description of the property as a plot. However, in the design and specification of the proposed building, it was mentioned that the property is already built upto stilt and ground floor and sanction sought for first, second and third floor. The proposed sanction plan

Contd...3/-

7. also showed that the stilt and the ground floor are existing and sanction is needed for first, second and third floor. The mistake committed by the appellant by mentioning the details of the property as plot in the application and in the indemnity bond seems to be inadvertent. It is relevant to note that in the indemnity bond, the appellant in para 1 mentioned the property as plot but in para 5 specified that the property consist of two and half storey i.e. stilt, ground and half first floor. She also mentioned that this construction was raised in 1972.
8. These mistakes of mentioning the description of the property as plot at one place and constructed at stilt and ground floor at other place in the same indemnity bond show that it was not deliberate, nor intentional on the part of the appellant. No prudent person shall mention the description of the property as plot as well as constructed in the same document. The proposed sanction plan clearly shows that the stilt and ground floor were existing when the sanction dated 15.11.2016 was obtained.
9. The impugned order show that the appellant as well as her Architect stated in their replies to the show cause notice dated 08.05.2017 issued u/s 338 of the DMC Act that a typographical error was committed by

Contd...4/-

mistake while referring the property as plot. The respondent did not consider this mistake as a clerical mistake. From the facts and discussions hereinabove, the mistake committed by the appellant while obtaining sanctioned building plan appears to be typographical an inadvertent error.

10. In these facts, the appeal is allowed and impugned revocation order dated 05.01.2018 is set-aside and the sanctioned building plan dated 15.11.2016 is restored.

11. However, the impugned order also referred that there are some non-compoundable unauthorized deviations in the property. Ld counsel for the appellant claims that the appellant has voluntarily demolished these constructions after 21.12.2016. Since none appeared for the respondent, this fact could not be verified. The respondent shall be at liberty to take action against the non-compoundable deviations as per law which are not in accordance to the sanctioned building plan dated 15.11.2016.

12. In view of the above observations, this appeal stand disposed of.

Contd...5/-

13. 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
22.07.2026

A.No. 249/18

22.07.2026

Present : Ms. Sana Ansari and Sh. I. Ahmad, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Sanjay Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC along with Sh. Ashok Kumar, ASO, NDMC.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the respondent as he is held up before Hon'ble High Court.

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

Put up for 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
22.07.2026

A.No. 278/19

22.07.2026

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

The property tax record relied by the appellant has been verified by the MCD and the certified copy is filed by the ld counsel for the respondent in this regard.

The respondent however seeks some more time to file the status report of the Administrative Officer, Civil Line Zone in respect of the category of the subject property whether it falls in G or H category. Let the same be so filed.

Put up for awaiting the status report and arguments on **10.08.2026.**

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 371/19

Dr. Maria Jamal and Anr. Vs. MCD

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Rishi Raj Gautam, Ld. counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent.

Previous cost of Rs. 10,000/- has not yet been deposited. Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant wants to pay the cost in two installments and he has today deposited the first installment of Rs. 5,000/- with the Registry and seeks some to pay the second installment. Let the second installment be deposited on or before the next date of hearing.

An adjournment is also sought on behalf of the appellant to address arguments in the appeal as main counsel Sh. Bharat Bhushan Bhatia has suffered with a heart stroke and he could not contact the appellant due to this reason. In the interest of justice one more opportunity is granted to the appellant to pay the second installment of cost and to address the arguments in the matter on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **15.09.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 20/21 & 370/21

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Vijay Kinger and Sh. Dhruv Dhingra, Lds counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Sagar Dhama, Ld. counsel for the respondent joined through VC.
Intervener Ashok Kumar in peson.

Arguments heard on the application seeking condonation of delay.

The appellant in appeal no. 20/21 has challenged the sealing order dated 16.07.2019 and in the other appeal no. 370/21 has challenged the demolition order dated 12.07.2019. The first appeal no. 20/21 was filed on 22.01.2021 challenging both these orders and subsequently, when it was apprised that only one order can be challenged in one appeal, the appellant filed the second appeal on 26.10.2021 challenging the demolition order dated 12.07.2019.

Prior to this, the appellant filed a Civil Suit no. 734/19 before the concerned court at Karkardooma Court, which was withdrawn on 11.02.2020 being not maintainable.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Suo Moto Writ petition no. 3/2020 exempted the period from 15.03.2020 to 28.02.2022 for the purposes of limitation. The appellant therefore, is required to explain the delay between

...contd.2

: 2 :

11.02.2020 to 14.03.2022 as for the period prior to 11.02.2020, he shall be entitled to the benefit of Section 14 of Limitation Act as the appellant was pursuing a remedy bonafidely before a court which did not have jurisdiction.

Ld counsel for the appellant has submitted that because of some communication gap between the previous counsel and the appellant and some restrictions before 15.03.2020 regarding Covid, the appeal could not be filed immediately after 11.02.2020.

In these facts, the delay in filing of these two appeals is condoned subject to cost of Rs. 1,000/- each in both the appeals to be deposited with Registry of this Tribunal.

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
22.07.2026

A.No. 414/22

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Sunil Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Anupam Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent
joined through VC along with Sh. R.K. Singh, Adv.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Ajay Chaudhary has suffered injuries due to fall from the stair-case.

Same is strongly opposed as the appellant has been seeking time since obtaining the interim protection on 27.07.2022.

However, in the interest of justice one last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter subject to cost of Rs. 3,000/- to be deposited with the Registry of this Tribunal.

Put up for arguments on **11.09.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 55/23 & 109/24

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant in appeal no. 55/23.
Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 55/23.
Sh. Armaan Monga, Ld. counsel for the appellant in appeal no. 109/24. Memo of appearance filed.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Id. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 109/24.
Ms. Deeksha Khandelwal, Ld. counsel for the intervener joined through VC along with intervener in person.

Arguments heard and concluded in appeal no. 55/23.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the appellant in appeal no. 109/24 on the ground that he has recently be engaged and he needs some time to go through the record and advance arguments.

In the interest of justice one more opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in appeal no. 109/24.

Put up for arguments on **17.09.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 57/23, 347/23 & 723/25

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Krishan Mohan, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. G.M. Farooqui, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Anupam Sharma, Ld. counsel for the DDA through VC along with Sh. R.K. Singh in appeals no. 57/23 & 347/23

Applications under Order XXII rule 3 CPC have been filed to implead the L.Rs of the deceased appellant along with his death certificate and vakalatnama for legal heirs filed. Copy supplied.

The applications were e-filed on 11.03.2026. The appellant as per the death certificate has passed away on 13.01.2026 and as such, the applications were in time and the right to sue survive. Infacts, the applications are allowed and the legal heirs are impleaded and the amended memos filed along with applications are taken on record.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as daughter of main counsel Sh. G.M. Farooqui is ill.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **04.11.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 218/23 & 219/23

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel the respondent.
Sh. Abhishek Gupta, Ld. counsel for the intervener joined through VC along with one intern in person.

An application under Order I rule 10 CPC filed on behalf of the intervener along with vakalatnama. Copy supplied. Ld. counsel for the appellant has placed on record copy of order dated 20.02.2026 passed by this Tribunal in appeals no. 151/17 and 237/17 vide which these two appeals of the interveners were dismissed.

An adjournment is sought by the Id. counsel for the respondent/MCD as he is in some personal difficulty today.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **03.11.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 404/23

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Gyanesh Saini, Ld counsel for the appellant along
with appellant.

Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

At request, put up for further 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
22.07.2026

A.No. 416/23

22.07.2026

Present : Mohd. Qamar, Id counsel for the appellant along with Appellant in person.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard on the application under Order VI rule 17 CPC filed by the appellant. Since the amendment sought is formal in nature, the same is allowed. The amended appeal is taken on record. The application stands disposed of.

Arguments heard on the applications seeking condonation of delay in filing the aforesaid appeal. Without going into the merits of the submissions made in the application and without prejudice to the rights of the respondent, with an endeavour to decide the appeal on merits, the delay is condoned subject to deposit a cost of Rs. 2,000/- with the Registry.

The applications stand disposed of.

At request, put up for arguments on appeal on **04.11.2026.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 686/23

22.07.2026

Present : Ms. Dhaneshwari, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.
None for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the appellant as her case file has been misplaced.

Even none has appeared for the respondent despite repeated calls since morning. No adverse order is being passed today.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **16.10.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 94/24

22.07.2026

Present :

Sh. J.K. Bhola, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC along with son of the appellant in person. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

Sh. Nitin Kasana, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Sh. Chirag Arora, Sh. Raj Rastogi and Sh. Ashish, Ld. counsels for the intervener.

An application has been filed on behalf of the intervener seeking dismissal of this appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

Copy supplied.

Heard on this application. The intervener states that in view of the order dated 17.08.2023 passed by Hon'ble High Court in W.P.(C) no. 1797/2023 where the husband and sons of the appellant were respondents, this appeal is not maintainable.

I have perused that order.

MCD filed status report in that writ stating that the subject property has already been booked and the action shall be taken on availability of the police force. In para 5 of this order, the Hon'ble High Court specifically stated that it has not adjudicated upon the rights and contentions of the owners which are expressly reserved. The appellants in these facts, have every right to challenge the said demolition order and the Hon'ble High Court did not observe in this order that the appellants have no right to file this appeal. This application is devoid of any merits and is hereby dismissed.

....contd.2

: 2 :

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the appellant on the ground that he has recently been engaged and needs some time to go through the record.

At request of Id. counsel for the appellant, put up for arguments on **08.10.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 172/24 & 173/24
Raziya Sharma Vs. MCD

22.07.2026

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Sagar Dhama, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that she has instructions from the appellant to withdraw the aforesaid appeals and she 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 appeals are 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
22.07.2026

A.No. 823/24

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Rakesh Chander Aggawal Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.
Sh. Atul Tanwar and Sh. Vaibhav Sanwal, Ld counsels for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought by the Id counsel for the appellant on the ground that because of heavy rain, he is struck up in the traffic jam.

Same is strongly opposed.

It is also stated for the respondent/MCD that the appellant has not complied with the order dated 18.10.2024 and almost two years have been passed since then.

There is no reason for non-complying with the order dated 18.10.2024 till date. Subject to cost of Rs. 5,000/- to be deposited with the Registry, the appellant is directed to comply with the order dated 18.10.2024.

At request, put up for arguments on **22.10.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 877/24

22.07.2026

Present : Dr. Gaurav Manuja, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC along with appellants in person.
Ms. Mehak Arora, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks some more time to file the sanctioned building plan.

Same is strongly opposed as the appellants after taking interim protection on the last date, which was six months before, are trying to delay the matter.

Infacts, one last and final opportunity is given to the appellant to file the sanctioned building plan on or before the next date of hearing.

At request, put up for 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
22.07.2026

A.No. 890/24

Panchshila Coop H/B Society Ltd. vs. MCD

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal and Ms. Mehvish Khan, Ld
counsels for the respondent joined through VC.

Ld counsel for the appellant has placed on record photocopy of the regularization sanction dated 09.07.2026 along with proof of payment of the regularization charges.

In view of the same, this appeal challenging the demolition order dated 26.09.2024 in respct of unauthorized construction has become infructuous as the unauthorized construction has now been regularized.

In view of the above, the appellant 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.

The property be delisted from the list of booked properties on the website of the MCD.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 921/24

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Hemant Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

It is stated by the Id counsel for the appellant that the MCD has not yet submitted the record and without inspection of the record, he is unable to argue today.

There is no vakalatnama of Id counsel for the appellant on the record. Let the same be filed during the course of day.

Respondent/MCD is directed to file the record and it can be inspected by the counsel for the appellant.

Put up for awaiting record and arguments on **28.10.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 493/25

22.07.2026

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

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

There is no interim protection report in this case. The MCD is directed to file the Action Taken Report on the next date of hearing.

Put up for awaiting the Action Taken Report and arguments on **06.11.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 532/25
Smt. Monika & Anr. vs. MCD.

22.07.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Despite various calls none is appearing on behalf of the
appellant in the Tribunal or through VC.
Put up at 2.00 PM.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD/22.7.26

At 2.35 pm

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

None has appeared on behalf of appellant since morning
in the Tribunal or through VC despite various calls.
None had appeared on behalf of the appellant on the
previous date as well.

It is already 2.35 PM. It appears that the appellant is not
interested in pursuing the appeal. The present appeal is
dismissed in default as well as non-prosecution.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 619/25

22.07.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
 Sh. Sagar Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent joined
 through VC.

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

There is no interim protection in the matter. The MCD is
directed to file the Action Taken Report on the next date
of hearing.

Put up for awaiting the Action Taken Report and
arguments on **16.11.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 627/25

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Divanshu Pandit along with Sh. Deepesh Arya, Ld
counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. V.K.
Aggarwal, counsel for the respondent.

Record has not yet been submitted by the MCD. Let the
AE(B) concerned is directed to be present with record
and it can be inspected by the counsel for the appellant.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as
main counsel Sh. V.K. Aggarwal has left the court due to
some personal urgency.

At request, put up for arguments on **16.11.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 668/25

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar and Sh. Vaibhav Sanwal, Ld counsels
for the respondent along with Sh. R.C. Meena, AE(B),
Najafgarh

It is stated on behalf of the respondent that MCD is reopening the regularization application of the appellant and will consider whether the subject property falls in unauthorized regularized colony and for which comments will be called from Town Planning Department.

Let the same be done and status report be filed on next date of hearing.

Put up for awaiting status report and arguments on
03.11.2026.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026

A.No. 696/25

22.07.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi and Sh. Burhan Zaki, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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

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

Put up for arguments on **10.09.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
22.07.2026