

A.No. 703/26

12.08.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Vinay Jaidka, 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 **14.09.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 705/26

12.08.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, 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 **14.09.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 706/26 & 707/26

12.08.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Aroma Khare, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Samaan Vardhan Gautam, counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent/MCD (appears on advance notice)

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.

At this stage, Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent/MCD, who appears on advance notice, seeks time to file the status report.

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**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 708/26

12.08.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Rishi 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 **16.09.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 709/26

12.08.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Rajesh Bhatia, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Nodal Officer for DDA (appears on advance notice)

Submissions heard. File perused.

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

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

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **19.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 710/26
Sunil Batra Vs. MCD

12.08.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Jayant Chauhan and Sh. Mayank Batra, 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 **27.11.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant ie. First and second floor of property no. 27-B, New Qutab Road, Sadar Bazar, Delhi-110006 in pursuance of the demolition order dated 30.07.2026. 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/12.08.26

A.No. 210/26

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Mohit Bangwal , Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. S. Adil Hussain, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC along with Ms. Rani Prajapati, Adv. along with Sh. Shailender Singh, AE(B) , Shahdara, South.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The record has already been deposited It can be inspected by the counsel for the appellant.

Ld. counsel for the appellant seeks time to inspect the record and to obtain the certified copy of the record and to argue the matter.

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
12.08.2026

A.No. 417/26 & 457/26

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Prashant Diwan, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC along with Sh. Vaibhav Sanwal, Adv. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

Status report is filed by the MCD in both the appeals, copy supplied.

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

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

At request, put up for arguments on **02.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 425/26

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Aagam Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Sh. Manoj Kumar, AE(B).
Sh. M.M. Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the intervener.

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.

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

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

Put up for reply and arguments on the said application as
well as appeal with connected appeal no. 552/26 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
12.08.2026

A.No. 526/26

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Vivek Gaur, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Abheet Mangleek, Ld counsel for the respondent no.
1. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.
Sh. Satish Kumar Tomar, Ld. counsel for the R-2 to R-4.
Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The record has already been deposited. It can be inspected by the counsel for the appellant.

Private respondents no. 2 to 4 seeks copy of the appeal.

Let the complete paper book be supplied to him within a week.

Reply, if any, by private respondents be filed within 4 weeks after receiving the copy, with advance copy to the other side.

Put up for arguments on **07.10.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 664/26

12.08.2026

Present : Mohd. Kaish, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ankur Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent joined
through VC.

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

Be awaited for record and arguments on **31.08.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 702/26

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Nitesh Basoya, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Abheet Mangleek, Ld counsel for the
respondent/MCD along with Ms. Mithlesh Kumari. 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. It can be inspected by the counsel for the
appellant.

Ld. proxy counsel seeks pass over in the matter as the
main counsel is held up before the Hon'ble High Court.
In view of the heavy cause list, the pass over is not
possible.

Put up for arguments on **09.09.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 312/24

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Tarun Sharma, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Parveen Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent
joined through VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. N.K. Sharma is not available today due to bad health.

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 **19.11.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 632/16

12.08.2026

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

It is stated for the appellant that there is some problem with the portal accepting the applications under PM Uday Yojna and the appellant seeks one more opportunity to get it registered under PM Uday Yojna and thereafter to regularized it.

Same is opposed.

At request, put up for arguments on **18.11.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 53/18

12.08.2026

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

Part arguments heard.

The grievance of the appellant is that the unauthorized construction shown in yellow colour in the regularization plan dated 16.11.2011, has not been demolished either by the other occupants, who are the owners of that yellow portion nor by the MCD and because of that unauthorized construction, the regularization dated 16.11.2011 was revoked vide impugned order dated 05.01.2018.

The MCD is directed to completely demolish the portion as shown in yellow colour in the regularization plan and then to file Action taken report/ status report on the next date of hearing

Put up for awaiting the status report and arguments on **08.10.2026.**

Interim orders, to continue with respect to other portion of the property till the next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 576/18

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Gaurav, LR of the appellant no. 2 in person.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld. proxy counsel for the respondent
joined through VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as
main counsel Sh. R.K. Kashyap has been suffering from
high fever.

Similar request is made on behalf of the appellant.

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

Put up for arguments on **12.10.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 673/18, 674/18 & 794/18

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Sankalp Malik, Sh. Suhail Khan and Ms. Vratika Mittal, Ld counsels for the appellant.
None for the respondent in appeal no. 794/18
Sh. Kunal Malik, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Umesh Barnwal, counsel for the respondent in other two appeals bearing no. 673/18 and 674/18.
Sh. Dinesh Dahiya, Ld. counsel for the ASI/respondent no. 2.

An application under Section 151 CPC filed by the appellant to place on record the additional documents.

Without prejudice to the rights of the respondent, the documents are taken on record. The application stands disposed of.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Umesh Barnwal is not well today.

Even none has appeared for the respondent in appeal no. 794/18 despite calls.

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

Put up for arguments on **29.10.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 476/19 & 477/19

12.08.2026

Present : Ms. Aroma Khare, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Samaan Vardhan Gautam, counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Prithish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent joined through VC.

Ld. proxy counsel seeks pass over in the matter as the main counsel is held up before the Hon'ble High Court. In view of the heavy cause list, the pass over is not possible.

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
12.08.2026

A.No. 99/20
Raje Lal Vs. MCD

12.08.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
 Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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

I have perused the record.

The show cause notice dated 18.09.2017 in respect of unauthorized construction in the shape of ground to second floor with projections on the municipal land in property no. 1915, Gali no. 11, Chuna Mandi, Pahar Ganj, New Delhi is reported to be served through pasting on 21.09.2017. Similarly, the demolition order dated 27.09.2017 is reported to be served through pasting on 03.10.2017. Neither there is any photograph nor witnesses to this pasting.

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

“It is observed that the service of show cause notice upon owner is found unsatisfactory and unreliable and, as such, most of the appeals, filed against the demolition orders, are allowed by the courts for lack of service of show cause notice upon owner. It has,

....contd.2

: 2 :

therefore, been decided that pasting of notice should be supported by photographic evidence. The JE concerned will ensure the photographic evidence of pasting of notice and such evidence will form part of U/C and sealing files. EE(B) of respective zone shall ensure the uploading of information regarding unauthorized construction on MCD website soon after the passing of the necessary orders for demolition”.

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

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

Further the service, as far as possible should be done by way of speed post and a copy of internet delivery report with postal receipt should be kept on record and where service is not possible and pasting is to be done, photograph of pasting be taken and signatures of witness be obtained with their name and address.

....contd.3

: 3 :

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.”

Record further shows that the vacation notice dated 19.08.2019 was duly served through pasting and the photographs thereof were also obtained. It is not clear as to why the photographs of pasting in respect of pasting of the show cause notice were not taken. The respondent is well aware that while serving through pasting, the photographs should be taken as were taken while service the vacation notice.

In these facts, the demolition order dated 27.09.2017 is 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 01.09.2026 at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

With above observations, 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
12.08.2026

A.No. 302/21

Bimla & Anr. Vs. MCD

12.08.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
 Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

None has appeared for the appellant despite calls till 3.00 p.m.

Arguments heard.

This appeal relates to 2021 and appellant has been seeking adjournment time and again.

I have perused the record. The appellants who are husband and wife have challenged the impugned demolition order dated 10.02.2021 passed in respect of unauthorized construction in the shape of deviations against the sanctioned building plan under 'Saral Scheme' dated 24.01.2020 from stilt to third floor with projections. The appellants purchased the property bearing No.10801-2 and 10813, Gali Phool Wali, Manakpura, Karol Bagh, New Delhi through two sale deeds both dated 15.01.2018. As per the description of the property mentioned in these sale deeds as well as in the site map annexed with the sale deed there was only ground floor in the property as on 15.01.2018. The appellants obtained a sanctioned building plan dated 24.01.2020 under 'Saral Scheme' and constructed the

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

property from stilt to third floor. The same was booked by the respondent for unauthorized construction vide show cause notice dated 03.02.2021. The same was not replied by the appellants though the reply was given to the demolition order on 23.02.2021. The respondent in the meantime passed the demolition order and also demolished one room at the second floor on 12.08.2021. The appellants applied for regularization on 20.09.2021 but the regularization was rejected for non-compliance of Invalid Notices vide order dated 25.02.2022. This order of rejection has not been challenged.

Admittedly, the construction has been raised in violation to the sanctioned building plan obtained under 'Saral Scheme'. The same was constructed after the cut-of date of protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 which 08.02.2007.

In these facts, there are no merits in this appeal. The same is dismissed. Demolition order is upheld.

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
12.08.2026

A.No. 199/22

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Pooran Singh Mahar, Ld. LAC for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

The appellant is directed to produce the original sale deed in favour of his mother along with site plan annexed with the said sale deed and he is also directed to file the copy thereof as well

Put up for further arguments on **26.11.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 331/23

Shiv Charan Vs. MCD

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Raghunandan Sharma, Ms. Usha Devi Sharma, Sh. Nishant Kaushik and Sh. Ayush Chauhan, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard at length.

1. This is an appeal challenging the demolition order dated 25.05.2023 passed in respect of unauthorized construction in the shape of ground, first and second floor in property no. 619, Gali No. 3, Shivaji Road, Pul Mithai, Delhi-110006.
2. The brief facts necessary for disposal of this appeal are that the respondent/MCD earlier booked the unauthorized construction in this property in the shape of one room at first floor in 2003 and passed a demolition order dated 09.09.2003. The appellant challenged this demolition order in appeal no. 468/04 and vide order dated 21.12.2004, the demolition order was set-aside and the matter was remanded back for fresh decision.
3. The respondent/MCD thereafter provided hearing to the appellant and passed fresh demolition order dated 11.07.2005 in respect of one room at the first floor. This order was challenged by the appellant in appeal

...contd.2

no. 286/05. In this appeal the appellant gave a statement on 18.08.2005 stating that he will apply for regularization of this room at first floor and in view of that statement the appeal was dismissed and withdrawn with directions to MCD to consider the regularization application. The regularization application was rejected by MCD on the ground that regularization of one room at first floor cannot be granted. The appellant thereafter voluntarily demolished that room at first floor.

4. Thereafter the respondent had issued fresh show cause notice dated 09.05.2023 booking unauthorized construction from ground to second floor and thereafter passed the impugned demolition order dated 25.05.2023.
5. The appellant has challenged this order primarily on the ground that the construction was existing even at the time of previous booking in 2003 but was never booked and only a room at the first floor was booked. This construction from ground to second floor is old and much prior to 08.02.2007 and is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. Ld counsel for the appellant argued that there were several

...contd.3

: 3 :

litigations including probate case in respect of this property which clearly show that the property is in existence much prior to 08.02.2007 and therefore the demolition order should be set-aside. In support of his arguments, the appellant has relied upon the following judgments: -

(1). Madan Gopal Vs. Municipal Corporation of Delhi 1962 R.L.R (N). 161.

(2). Municipal Corporation, Delhi Vs. Janki Pershad 1972 R.L.R 31.

(3). M/s Sahib Dayal Chaman Lal Vs. Municipal Corporation of Delhi 1977 (13 DLT 17).

(4). Bhagat Ram Vs. Municipal Corporation of Delhi 1974 R.L.R. (N) 2.

6. Ld counsel for the respondent/MCD on the other hand argued that there are variations in respect of the existing construction in the property as mentioned in the appeal viz-a-viz the site plan filed along with the appeal. The second booking is in continuation of the previous booking of 2003 and the appellant has reconstructed the entire property from ground to first floor and the same is not protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 and the appeal is liable to be dismissed.

....contd.4

7. I have perused the record. The appellant in appeal no. 286/05 has given the description of the property. In para 2 of that appeal it was specifically mentioned that the property consist of ground floor, first floor and half portion of second floor. The statement of the appellant was recorded on oath by this Tribunal in that appeal on 18.08.2005 and in that statement the appellant mentioned that the total construction is upto second floor and the second floor has two rooms and one store and the appellant shall seek regularization of alleged unauthorized one room at first floor. This statement was accepted and the appeal was withdrawn with liberty to be appellant to seek regularization of this room. This statement made in August, 2005 clearly proves that property was constructed upto second floor in 2005.
8. Further, if the ground floor and only a room at first floor was in existence in 2003 when the room at first floor was booked, why the respondent did not book the ground floor in 2003 is unexplained. There is no material on record to show that the property was completely demolished and entre new structure has been constructed. Contrary to it the photographs filed by the respondent along with the status report

....contd.5

: 5 :

clearly show that the construction is very old and much prior to 08.02.2007 except one room at the first floor which has already been demolished.

9. The site plan filed with the appeal clearly shows that there exist only three rooms at the second floor which were existing even in 2005. As far as the arguments of the respondent that there are variations of existing construction as mentioned in the appeal and as shown in the site plan, I do not find any material variation except that the covered varandah have been mentioned as open space at ground and first floor. Further, this variation cannot be a reason to hold that fresh construction has been raised by demolishing the entire structure.
10. The property therefore being in existence prior to 08.02.2007 is protected under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011. However, there is no sanctioned building plan and therefore the impugned demolition order dated 25.05.2023 is kept in abeyance till the National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 is in force. The respondent is at liberty to take action once the Act ceases to be in force. Appeal stands disposed of.

.....contd.6

: 6 :

11. 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
12.08.2026

A.No. 593/23

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. G.R. Verma and Sh. K.K. Suri, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Mehvish Khan, Ld. proxy counsel for the respondent joined through VC.

It is stated for the appellant that the regularization application filed on 29.08.2023 with the MCD is still pending.

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

Put up for awaiting the report and arguments on **06.11.2026.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 145/24

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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

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

Put up for arguments on **01.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 209/24

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.
Sh. Malaya Kumar Chand, intervener joined through VC.

Intervener submits that his application for urgent hearing shall be listed today before Hon'ble Division Bench and he may be permitted to argue subject to any order passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench.

In fact put up for arguments on **13.08.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 276/24

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Prashant Diwan and Ms. Ishita Bansal, Id counsel for the appellant.

None for the respondent.

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

No adverse order is being passed 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.

Put up for arguments on **04.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 693/24

12.08.2026

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

Part arguments heard.

The appeal filed by the appellant against the order of this Tribunal dismissing the challenge to the demolition order is stated to be pending before Id. Principal District & Sessions Judge, Patiala House Court and is now listed for 05.09.2026.

At request, put up for further arguments on **01.10.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 918/24

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Sunil Lalwani, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Ajit Singh, Id. counsel for the Intervener along with
intervener in person.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

MCD seeks some more time to file the status report in
respect of regularization application of the appellant.

Arguments on maintainability of the application under
order 1 Rule 10 CPC heard. Even if it is presumed that
all the averments made in the application is correct, then
also in this proceeding between the appellant and the
MCD the applicant has no right to participate and he
cannot become a party as there is a clear-cut judgment of
Delhi High Court in case ***Hardayal Singh Mehta Vs
MCD, AIR 1990 Delhi 170*** in which it is held that in the
matter between the appellant and the MCD, no third
person can join and become a party to such proceedings
and in such proceedings the application under order 1
Rule 10 CPC is not maintainable. Any dispute between
the applicant and the appellant has to be dealt with and to
be decided by the Civil Court separately. Accordingly,
application moved by applicant under order 1 Rule 10

...contd.2

: 2 :

CPC is hereby dismissed. However, the applicant is permitted to file the documents, if any and to orally argue the matter at the final arguments stage.

Put up for awaiting the status report and arguments on **27.11.2026.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 157/25

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. H.R. Khan, Ms. Sabina Fatima, Sh. Kashif Salman,
Sh. Zuber Khan, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Reply to the application under Order VI rule 17 CPC as well as to the application condonation of delay u/s 5 of Limitation Act filed. Copy supplied.

Arguments heard on both the application.

Through the application under Order VI rule 17 CPC filed by the appellant, the appellant sought amendment in the prayer clause of the appeal by challenging the demolition order dated 22.07.2020 inadvertently mentioned as 14.07.2020 in this application. Since the amendment sought is formal and is not opposed, the same is allowed. The application stands disposed of. Fresh amended appeal be filed accordingly.

Arguments heard on the application seeking condonation of delay in filing the aforesaid appeal. As per the appellant, he was never served with the demolition order and received the vacation notice dated 20.02.2025 which was immediately challenged in this appeal and therefore, the delay should be condoned. Same is opposed.

...contd.2

: 2 :

Without prejudice to the rights of the parties regarding service of the demolition order and with an endeavour to decide the appeals on merits, the delay is condoned.

The applications stand disposed of.

At request, put up for arguments on appeal on **25.11.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 762/25 & 763/25

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Paras Aggarwal, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 762/25.
Sh. Sanjay Sethi, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 763/25 through VC. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.
Sh. Avijeet Kumar, Ld. counsel for the intervener along with intervener.

Written arguments filed on behalf of the intervener. Copy not supplied to the appellant and MCD. Let the same be supplied today itself.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 763/25 as he is not well today.

At request, put up for arguments on **07.10.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 90/26, 91/26, 92/26, 93/26, 94/26, 95/26, 96/26, 97/26 98/26 & 99/26

12.08.2026

Present :

Sh. Aditya Kaushik, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 97/26 and 98/26. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 90/26 and 94/26.
None for the respondent in appeal no. 93/26 and 92/26.
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 91/26 and 95/26 joined through VC. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record
Sh. Chetan Hasija, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 96/26 and 99/26. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

Reply to interim application filed in appeal no. 97/26 and 98/26.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel is not well today.

Same is strongly opposed.

However, in the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is granted to the appellant to address the arguments in the matter on next date of hearing subject to deposit a cost of Rs. 500/- in each appeal with the Registry of this

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
12.08.2026

A.No. 181/26
Nirmala Devi Vs. MCD

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Vinod Dahiya, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent. Fresh
Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

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
12.08.2026

A.No. 327/26

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. M. Sufian Siddiqui, Sh. Rakesh Bhugra and Mohd. Mazhar Ahmad, Ld counsels for the appellant along with appellant in person.

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent aonghweith Sh. Anil Kumar, AE(B).

Sh. Vinod Dahiya, Id. counsel for the respondent no 2.

Written statement along with reply and copy of sale deed filed on behalf of the respondent no. 2. Copy supplied.

Arguments of appellant and R-2 heard and concluded.

At request of Ld. counsel for the MCD, put up for arguments by the respondent MCD 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
12.08.2026

A.No. 402/26

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Mahir Goel, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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

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 **27.11.2026**.

There is no interim protection in the matter. Let the Action taken report be filed by the respondent/MCD on next date of hearing.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
12.08.2026

A.No. 158/22

12.08.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Praveen Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.
None for the intervener.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present appeal is 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
12.08.2026