

A.No. 820/26

10.09.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Vikas Chhabra, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Ld counsel for the appellant has filed the copy of the rent agreement on record. Since the notice has not yet been issued, same is taken on record.

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 **08.10.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 831/26

10.09.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. R.S. Verma, 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 **07.10.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 836/26
Lalita Gupta Vs. MCD

10.09.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Naveen Kaushik, 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 **25.11.2026**.
Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. Flat no. 5, Mitra Vihar, Pitam Pura, Delhi-110034 in pursuance of the demolition order dated 14.08.2026. 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
10.09.2026

A.No. 838/26

10.09.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Vijay Dahiya, Sh. Sushant Dahiya and Sh. Bhupesh Rana, Ld counsels 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 **15.09.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 844/26
V.P. Johri and Ors. vs.MCD

10.09.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Lokesh Bhardwaj, Ms. Gitika Ojha and Sh. Jatin 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 **24.09.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against
the property of appellant i.e. G-17G, South Ex. Part-II, New
Delhi in pursuance of the demolition order dated
03.08.2026. 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
10.09.2026

A.No. 849/26
Zeeshan Hilal Vs. MCD

10.09.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Pooran Chand, 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 **26.11.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. property no. 285, Basti Hazrat Nizamuddin, New Delhi, in pursuance of the demolition order dated 06.08.2026 as the appellant has applied for regularization of the existing structure on 12.08.2026. 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/10.9.26

A.No. 853/26
Saurabh Bidhuri Vs. MCD

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Anand Awasthi and Sh. Rishab Jain , Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

This is an appeal challenging the show cause notice dated 25.08.2026, which was duly replied by the appellant. The appeal against the show cause notice is not maintainable before this Tribunal being pre-mature. 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
10.09.2026

A.No. 857/26

Gulshan Katyal Vs. MCD

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Sachin Dabas and Ms. Lipika Chawla, Ld counsels for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The appellant has challenged vacation notice dated 31.08.2026 passed u/s 349 of the DMC Act.

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**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant bearing No. RZ-19A, measuring 400 sq. yds. Village Sayed, Nangloi, Delhi pursuance of the order dated 31.08.2026. However, 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

....contd.2

: 2 :

that no encroachment on the public land is protected.
The appellant is directed not to raise any further
construction in the property in question.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 863/26

Brahm Prakash Choudhary and Anr. Vs. MCD

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, 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 **26.11.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. property no. 32, Kallu Sarai, New Delhi, in pursuance of the sealing order dated 24.08.2026. 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.

Copy of this order be given dasti as requested.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 868/26

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Yati Ranjan and Rahul Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

There is no prima facie in favour of the appellant. No ground for grant of interim stay is made out at this stage.

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 **30.09.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 871/26 & 872/26

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Rajat Taneja, Id. senior counsel along with Sh. Rishabh Jain, Ld. proxy 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.

It is submitted by the Id. senior counsel appearing for the appellant that the demolition order was served only on 05.09.2026 giving 15 days time to the appellant to demolish the alleged unauthorized construction and those 15 days have not yet been expired.

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **17.09.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 528/24

10.09.2026

Present : Appellant in person with proxy counsel.

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

The next date of hearing in the matter is 22.10.2026. The appeal is of the year 2024. In view of the heavy pendency, no early hearing is possible. The application is dismissed.

Put up on the date fixed i.e. **22.10.2026** for the purpose fixed.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 881/25
Rahim Baksh Vs. MCD

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Neeraj Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Sagar Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent alongwith Sh. Rakesh Kumar, JSA, Shahdara North Zone, MCD.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

Submissions heard.

The appellant has claimed that the Judicial Committee directed him to file appeal before this Tribunal but no such document in this regard has been furnished.

I have perused the record. The impugned sealing order dated 20.06.2025 was passed in violation of Section 345-A r/w 416, 417, 419, 347 & 491 of the DMC Act.

Since, the orders have been passed regarding misuse by running a factory, this Tribunal does not have jurisdiction as per status report filed by the MCD. The appellant is at liberty to approach appropriate forum.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No 248/26, 249/26, 250/26 & 251/26

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent in appeal no. 248/26.
Ms. Shivani Panwar, Ld counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 249/26.
Sh. Sunil Kumar Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent in
appeal no. 250/26.
Sh. Dharamvir Gupta, Ld. counsel for respondent in
appeal no. 251/26.

Part arguments heard.

The record relating to the demolition and sealing
proceedings are tagged in another appeal bearing no.
202/26 and 203/26 which are now fixed for 28.10.2026.

At request, put up for arguments on **05.11.2026**.

The file of appeal no. 202/26 and 203/26 be also put up
on 05.11.2026 as well as on 28.10.2026, the date given
in those appeals.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 522/26

10.09.2026

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

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The record has 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 argue the matter.

At request, put up for arguments on the aspect of
limitation and **17.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 581/26 & 582/26

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Sidhi Arora, Id counsel for the respondent/MCD.
Memo of appearance filed.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent along
with Ms. Mithlesh Kumar, AE(B).

Arguments heard at length.

Put up for orders 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
10.09.2026

A.No. 829/26
Pradeep Kumar and Others vs. MCD

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Arnav Dhama, Ld counsel for the appellant.

The matter is listed for arguments on the maintainability of the appeal, which is against the show cause notice, which is not appealable before this Tribunal.

At this stage, Ld. counsel for the appellants submits that he has instructions from the appellants to withdraw the aforesaid appeal 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 appellants, the aforesaid appeal stands disposed off as withdrawn.

Appeal file be consigned to record room.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 74/19

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Mohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent
alongwith Ms. Sakshi Shedha, Architect Asstt.
Sh. Subhash Chand and Sh. Rakesh Kaushik, Ld.
Counsel for applicant/intervener.

At request of Ld. counsel for the appellant, the matter is
adjourned 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
10.09.2026

A.No. 318/21 & 54/22

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Sanam Malhotra, Ld. counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

Arguments on behalf of the appellant heard.

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

Put up for arguments on behalf of the respondent on
03.12.2026.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 16/22

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Saurabh Choubey, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Anupam Sharma, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Previous cost has been deposited.

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further 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
10.09.2026

A.No. 666/22 & 294/24

10.09.2026

Present : Ms. Kamal Sant, Id. proxy counsel for Sh. Anuj Garg, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 294/24.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 666/22.
Ms. Mithlesh Kumari, AE(B) in person.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

As per this status report, a letter dated 13.06.2014 was received from the appellant seeking repairs of the subject property.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Anuj Garg 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 **20.11.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 448/23

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. , Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. , Ld counsel for the respondent.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 760/23 & 799/23

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Amit Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

At request, put up for further 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
10.09.2026

A.No. 41/24 & 986/24

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Charanpreet Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 986/24.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Id counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 41/24.

It is submitted by the Id counsel for the appellant that in view of MPD-2047, the appellant is entitled to get the property regularized and as soon as the respondent shall start accepting the application for regularization in terms of MPD-2047, the appellant, who has already prepared the demand draft towards the application amount, shall apply for the same.

IN these facts, put up for further arguments subject to outcome of any such application on **21.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 400/24

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Vikram Saini, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Avishek Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Arvind Chaurasiya, Ld. Id counsel for the respondent no. 2. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

Ld. counsel for R-2 seeks complete copy of the paper-book.

The appellant is directed to supply the same within 3 days and reply be filed by the R-2 within 4 weeks thereafter with advance copy to the Id counsel for the respondent/MCD and also to the appellant.

Put up for arguments on **17.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 429/24

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. R.K. Pandey, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

At request made by the Id counsel for the appellant, put
up for further arguments on **17.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 470/24

10.09.2026

Present :

Sh. Siddharth Mullick, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.

Sh. Nishant Walia, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Prithish Sabharwal, counsel for the respondent.

Part arguments heard.

The appellant through PTRs for the year 2006-07 has shown that the covered area of the subject property is 114 sq. mtrs., claims protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011.

The status report of the MCD does not specify the covered area of the property existing on date including the room at terrace.

The concerned AE(B) is directed to physically inspect the property and to measure the covered area in the property and to file status report in this regard on the next date of hearing along with rough site plan. The appellant shall cooperate in this physical inspection.

Put up awaiting the status report and arguments on **16.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 715/24, 716/24 & 717/24

10.09.2026

Present :

Ms. Ankita, SPA Holder of the appellant.
Sh. Anupam Sharma, Id. counsel for the DDA,
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent/MCD.

Ld. counsel for the DDA seeks better particulars of the subject property to file the status report whether the subject property is governed by the MCD or DDA.

The appellant claims that the DDA has filed status report before the Hon'ble High Court in W.P.(C) no. 2155/2023 stating the DDA does not have jurisdiction qua the subject property.

The appellant is directed to file the copy of the status report within a week with advance copy to the counsel for the DDA as well as MCD. DDA is directed to file the status report after receiving the copy of the said status report.

Ld. counsel for the MCD submits that copy of the contempt application has not yet been received. The appellant admits that she has not supplied the said copy to the Registry. Let the copy be supplied to the Id counsel for the respondent today itself. Reply, if any, to this contempt application be filed on or before the next date of hearing with advance copy to the opposite side.

Put up for arguments on the contempt application and appeal on **18.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD/10.9.26

A.No. 70/25

10.09.2026

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

Part arguments heard.

Put up for further 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
10.09.2026

A.No. 396/25 & 399/25

10.09.2026

Present : Ms. Anju Lal along with Sh. Chirag Khurana, Ms. Shalu Lal, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Ms. Vasu Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Id. counsel for the intervener.

It is stated by the Id counsel for the appellant that the application for fire NOC is still pending before the Delhi Fire Service and some more time be given to argue this appeal.

Same is opposed.

One last and final opportunity is given to the appellant to advance arguments on the next date of hearing.

At request, put up for arguments on **24.09.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 489/25

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Mrinal Singh and Sh. Tathagat Thakur, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellants. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record
Sh. Jasleen Kaur, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the appellant as she has recently been engaged and needs some time to go through the record.

At request, put up for arguments on **18.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 658/25

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Nishant Walia, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Prithish Sabharwal, counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The record has already been produced. 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 **16.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 696/25

10.09.2026

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

Part arguments heard.

At request, ut up for further arguments on **22.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 854/25 & 855/25

10.09.2026

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

The record has already been deposited in both the appeals. 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 **22.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 82/26

10.09.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Id. Standing counsel for the respondent.

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

The appellant has not filed any application seeking condonation of delay.

Put up for further arguments on **18.12.2026**.

In view of the above conduct of the appellant, the interim protection is hereby vacated.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

At 2.30 pm

Case file is taken up again on the appearance and request made by the appellant's counsel Ms. Sana Ansari and Sh. I. Ahmad, who has placed on record an application seeking condonation of delay in filing this appeal along with fresh vakalatnama. Copy of the respondent is placed on record and it can be collected.

Soft copy may be supplied on e-mail and whatsapp.

In view of the request made, the interim order is hereby restored.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD/10.9.26

A.No. 144/26

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Harsimran Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC. .
None for the respondent.

The appellant seeks some more time to apply for regularization as the appellant was in judicial custody.

Even none has appeared on behalf of respondent since morning despite various calls.

Parties are given one more opportunity to advance arguments on next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **18.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 15/26 (M)

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Sagar Chauhan, Ld counsel for the applicant/
appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent.

This is an application seeking restoration of the appeal, which was dismissed in default on 28.01.2026. The application was filed on 06.03.2026.

Without going into the contentions made by ld counsel for the appellant and merits of the application, the application is allowed and the appeal be restored to its original number subject to deposit a cost of Rs. 2,000/- with the Registry of this Tribunal.

Put up for producing the receipt of cost and arguments on **16.12.2026.**

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 194/26

10.09.2026

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

It is submitted by the Id counsel for the respondent that regularization application of the appellant is still pending.

Be awaiting for outcome of the said application and arguments on **22.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 265/26
Anand Kumar vs. MCD

10.09.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Mohd. Zaid Suleman, 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/10.9.26

At 2.50 pm

Present : None for the appellant.
Mohd. Zaid Suleman, 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 2.50 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
10.09.2026

A.No. 306/26

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Zuber Ali, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC alongwith Sh. Harish Kaushik Adv.
Sh. Sidhi Arora, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

It is submitted on behalf of the appellant that the appellant has already applied for regularization on 27.07.2026. Copy of application supplied to the Id counsel for the respondent.

Let the MCD to file the status report in respect of this regularization application on the next date of hearing.

Put up for awaiting the status report and arguments on **18.12.2026.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 347/26

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Varun Bhandari, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Shivani Panwar, Ld. proxy counsel for the respondent.

The respondent seeks some more time to file the status report in respect of regularization application of the appellant as the AE is under suspender.

At request, put up for awaiting the status report and arguments on **21.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 401/26

10.09.2026

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

An application seeking permission to file electricity bill is filed on behalf of the appellant.

Without prejudice to the rights of the respondent, the document/bill is taken on record. The application stands disposed of.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **10.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 453/26

10.09.2026

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

Part arguments heard.

At request made by the ld counsel for the respondent, put up for further 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
10.09.2026

A.No. 536/26 & 636/26

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Sunil Kumar, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent.

An application filed by the appellant in appeal no. 636/36 to place on record the additional documents. Copy supplied.

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 appellant as main counsel has met with an accident and suffered fracture in his hand.

MCD is directed to file the status report whether the property is lying sealed or the seal has been tampered, along with the clear photographs of the photographs on next date of hearing.

At request, put up for arguments on **15.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 633/26

10.09.2026

Present : Ms. Shalu, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Nishant Walia, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Kritik Manchanda is not available today due to stomach infection.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **18.12.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 742/26

Raj Kumar Sehrawat Vs MCD

10.09.2026

Present : Ms. Nidhi Rai, Ld counsel for the appellant. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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

The appellant has placed on record the Geo Coordinates of plot no. 8, Tara Nagar and Plot no. 8, Kakrola Housing Complex to demonstrate that these two are different properties and the property booked is plot no. 8, Tara Nagar whereas the property of the appellant is plot no. 8, Kakrola House Complex. Further, the services of show cause notice and the demolition order has been disputed. The MCD record shows that it contains only 5 pages out of which, 3 are the FIR, show cause notice and impugned order. There is no proof of service nor any noting in the concerned file.

Let the AE(B) concerned is directed to be present in the court for explanation and also produce the remaining record, if available of the proceedings u/s 344/343 DMC Act as well as the status report whether there are two different properties i.e. Plot no. 8, Tara Nagar and Plot no. 8, Kakrola Housing Complex.

Contd...2..

-2-

Put up for awaiting status report and arguments on appeal on **10.12.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no demolition action be taken against the property of appellant 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.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 108/24

10.09.2026

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

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present appeal is dismissed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026

A.No. 448/23

Arun Vastra Bhandar (P) Ltd. Vs. MCD

10.09.2026

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

1. Vide this order I will dispose of the application seeking condonation of delay in filing this appeal. The appellant has challenged the sealing order dated 22.02.2019 and the appeal has been filed on 20.07.2023 after a delay of more than 4 years.
2. The appellant has sought condonation on the ground that the sealing action at the third floor of the property bearing no. 4350, Jogiwara, Nai Sarak, Delhi-110006 was taken on 24.02.2023 and the sealing order was never served upon the appellant or on the predecessor in interest of the appellant and therefore the delay should be condoned.
3. Ld counsel for the respondent has opposed the same on the ground that admittedly the appellant purchased this property on 23.09.2020 and as such there can be no occasion with MCD to serve the show cause notice and the sealing order upon the appellant, which are prior in time. Further, the third floor was sealed on 22.02.2019 when the sealing order was passed and that seal was tempered for which an FIR was

Contd...2/-

: 2 :

registered by MCD and later the appellant without verifying the aspect of booking, purchased the property which was already under action and there are no grounds to condone the delay. It was also argued that an appeal filed by the appellant against the demolition order was also dismissed on the grounds of limitation on 12.01.2024 and that order has been upheld by the second Appellate Court and similarly this appeal should also be dismissed

4. I have perused the record. The respondent booked the subject property u/s 344/343 DMC Act vide show cause notice dated 08.10.2018 followed by the demolition order dated 15.02.2019. Similarly, the show cause notice u/s 345A DMC Act dated 29.11.2018 was issued followed the sealing order dated 22.02.2019. The appellant purchased the property on 23.09.2020 which was subsequent to all these dates and therefore the appellant cannot argue that he was never served.
5. Further, record shows that one civil suit was filed against the subject property bearing civil suit no. 275/22 before Ld. ASCJ Central District, Tis Hazari, Delhi wherein appellant was defendant no. 1 and MCD was defendant no. 4. MCD filed written statement in that suit on 11.05.2022 wherein it was

Contd...3/-

: 3 :

clearly mentioned in para 3 of preliminary objections that a sealing order dated 22.02.2019 has already been passed against the subject property. The appellant cannot claim that he did not gain knowledge about the sealing order from this written statement along with which even copy of the sealing order was annexed.

6. The appellant cannot have a right better than its predecessor to challenge the impugned order. The subject property was sealed on 22.02.2019 and from the date of that sealing action, the predecessor of the appellant had knowledge of the sealing order. He tampered with the seal for which an FIR was registered on the complaint of the MCD. The appellant after purchasing the property subsequent to the sealing action dated 22.02.2019 cannot be permitted to seek condonation of delay only because he purchased the property subsequently.
7. When the sealing order was duly served upon the predecessor in interest of the appellant, the appellant cannot be permitted to file appeal after more than four years without explaining the delay. Reliance in this regard can be placed on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in **P.K. Ramchandran**

Contd...4/-

: 4 :

Vs. State of Kerala & Ors. 1997 (7) SCC 556. The application seeking condonation of delay is dismissed and accordingly the appeal is also dismissed.

8. Record of the respondent, if any, be returned along with copy of this order and appeal file be consigned to record room. The record of appeal no. 70/23 tagged with this appeal be also consigned to record room.

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

10.09.2026

A.No. 821/24 & 822/24
Neha Jainwal & Ors. Vs. MCD

10.09.2026

Present : Sh. Dalip Rastogi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Mehak Arora, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC.

1. Vide this order I will dispose of the applications seeking condonation of delay in filing these two appeals. Both the appeals were filed on 23.09.2024 and the six appellants have challenged the sealing order dated 12.09.2019 in appeal No. 821/24 and the demolition order dated 29.07.2019 in appeal No. 822/24.
2. The appellants who are the owners of right hand side and left hand side flats at stilt, ground and first floor of property no. D-147-148, Freedom Fighter Enclave, Neb Sarai, New Delhi have sought condonation of delay on the ground that they came to know about this order on 16.09.2024 when the MCD served the vacation notice dated 01.08.2024 through pasting. When they inquired from MCD, they were informed about the impugned orders and therefore, the delay should be counted from the date of knowledge which

Contd...2/-

is 16.09.2024 and if any should be condoned. Ld counsel for the appellants argued that the show cause notices as well as the impugned orders were not even served upon the predecessor in interest of the appellants and therefore the date of calculating the limitation for filing these appeals shall start from the date of knowledge of the appellants which is 16.09.2024 and the delay should be condoned for which reliance has been placed on the judgment passed in **Umrao Singh Vs MCD 1966 DLT 471**.

3. Ld. counsels for the respondent on the other hand argued that all the six appellants have not filed the documents to show their ownership. Only appellants No.1, 2 and 5 have filed unregistered documents to show their ownerships. They all purchased their respective portions after the two impugned orders were passed and they cannot claim that the show cause notices and the impugned orders were not served upon their predecessors. Further, the sealing action and demolition action were taken several times against this entire property including the floors of the appellants and therefore they cannot claim non-service of the impugned orders and the delay being unexplained and inordinate, cannot be condoned.

Contd...3/-

4. I have perused the record. Admittedly, the appellants purchased their respective portions only after the two impugned orders were passed. The MCD had no reason to serve the appellants who are subsequent purchasers. Appellant No.1, purchased left hand side stilt flat on 06.11.2020, appellant No.2, purchased right hand side stilt flat on 06.10.2021 and the appellant no. 5, purchased left hand side second floor flat on 01.02.2021. The appellants No. 3, 4 and 6 have not filed even a single document to show that they are owners/occupiers or aggrieved from the impugned orders though they claim ownership of the first floor left hand side and right hand side flat and second floor right hand side flat respectively.
5. The appellants cannot have a right to challenge the impugned orders better than their predecessor. The predecessor did not bother to challenge the impugned orders and malafidely sold the booked property to the appellants who without verifying as to whether the property has been constructed as per law, purchased the property.
6. Record further shows that the respondent sealed one flat at stilt floor, two toilets at stilt floor and the top floor with entire lift on 06.11.2019. The property was sealed at these floors and the appellant No.1 and 2

Contd...4/-

claim ownership of the stilt floor. Once, the action was taken at stilt floor on 06.11.2019 but was never challenged, the appellants cannot be permitted to argue that their predecessor had no knowledge of the sealing order. The predecessor tempered with the seal for which an FIR was registered with Delhi Police at PS: Mehrauli and charge sheet was also filed against the then owner.

7. Further, even the lift of the property was sealed and the same is sufficient to give knowledge to the predecessor of the appellants about the sealing action. Not only that the action was taken on 06.11.2019, after the seal was tempered it was again re-affixed on 02.07.2020, 23.03.2023 and further the demolition action was taken at the third and fourth floor of the property.
9. None of the appellants bothered to check the status of the property before purchasing through unregistered documents. The judgment relied upon by the Ld. counsel for the appellants is not applicable to the facts of the present case as in that case the demolition order was received by the father of the owner on 16.04.1965 and the son claimed that the father handed over to him on 17.04.1965 and the Hon'ble High Court held that the limitation should be

Contd...5/-

calculated from 17.04.1965. The appellants were not even in picture at the time of passing the impugned orders and at the time of sealing action and cannot claim that they had no knowledge and the delay should be condoned. The delay is inordinate and unexplained and cannot be condoned. Reliance in this regard can be placed on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in **P.K. Ramchandran Vs. State of Kerala & Ors. 1997 (7) SCC 556**. The applications seeking condonation of delay are dismissed and accordingly the appeals are also dismissed.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
10.09.2026