A.No. 934/26
Nirbhay Kushwaha Vs. MCD

25.09.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Ms. Shikha Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

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

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

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **01.12.2026.**

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. Flat no. 395, Block E, Pkt 03, Paradise Apartments, Sector-18, Rohini, Delhi, in pursuance of the demolition order dated 07.09.2026. 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
25.09.2026

A.No. 935/26 : Deepak Arora and Ors. Vs. MCD
A. No.936/26 : Sunil Arora and Ors. Vs. MCD

25.09.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Arjun, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.

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 **09.12.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. Shop no. 9 and 10, Ground and First floor, Sewa Nagar, New Delhi, in pursuance of the demolition order dated 17.08.2026. 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
25.09.2026

A.No. 940/26
Vipin Kumar Kakkar and Anr. vs. MCD

25.09.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

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

Arguments heard. File perused.

The show cause notice dated 01.06.2026 in respect of the two properties bearing no. KNF-1 (Part) and KNF-2 (Part), Gali no. 10, Anand Parbat Industrial Area, Delhi, was issued in the name of one Bachan Bharti, which was replied by the appellants and thereafter, the impugned demolition order dated 24.08.2026 was passed in the name of the appellants.

Ld counsel for the appellants has relied upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in '***Mahinder Singh & Ors. vs. Municipal Corporationof Delhi 34 (1988) Delhi Law Times 118.***'

Keeping in view of this judgment, the impugned demolition order dated 24.08.2026 is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply dated 15.06.2026 and any further documents to be submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant. The demolition order shall be considered as show cause notice.

….contd.2

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 27.10.2026 at 3.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

The appeal stands disposed of.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 942/26
Meenakshi Pahuja Vs. MCD

25.09.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

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 with connected appeal bearing no. 998/24 on **29.09.2026.**

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant in pursuance of the demolition order dated 07.09.2022. 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
25.09.2026

A.No. 529/24

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Sudhior Balyan Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Jai Gupta, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta counsel for the respondent.

It is stated by the ld counsel for the appellant that the issue of inclusion of the plot in the layout plan after sub-division is still subjudice before Town Planning Department.

MCD is directed to file status report in this regard on the next date of hearing.

Put up for awaiting status report and arguments on **03.02.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 719/24 & 679/26
Anjum Afaque Vs. MCD

25.09.2026

Present : Mohd. Ikhlaq, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Abheet Mangleek, Ld. counsel for the respondent.

Case files are taken up today on the applications seeking permission to withdraw the aforesaid appeals.

Ld. counsel for the appellant submits that appellant wants to withdraw the aforesaid appeals and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeals.

Statement of the appellant himself, who has duly been identified by the counsel, recorded separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by 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
25.09.2026

A.No. 434/26

25.09.2026

Present : Ms. Ishika , Ld. proxy 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.

Be awaited for record and arguments for **04.02.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 662/26

25.09.2026

Present : Ms. Suman Kapoor , Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC along with ld. proxy counsel. 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.

Regularization application of the appellant has been rejected on 22.09.2026, but the appellant claims that same has not yet been communicated to the appellant and further the appellant gave reply to the Invalid Notice received on 25.08.2026 on 23.09.2026 and the reasons for rejections are not known to the appellant.

The office record shows that the appellant has raised fresh construction of the entire property and it is not a case of renovation and repairs. There is no prima facie case in favour of the appellant and the interim protection is hereby vacated.

At request, put up for arguments on the interim application on **03.12.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 729/26

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Neeraj Kumar Shah, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC along with appellant in person.
None for the respondent.

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

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for awaiting report and arguments on **05.02.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 734/26
Rehana Begum Vs. MCD

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Ojas Singh Sachdeva, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. S. Adil Hussain, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Sri Niwas, AE(B). 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 ld counsel for the appellant.

1. Arguments heard on the application seeking condonation of delay in filing this appeal as well as interim application.
2. It is argued for the appellant that since the impugned demolition order is silent in respect of the period in which an appeal can be preferred against the said order, there is no period of limitation for filing the appeal and therefore the appeal is within time.
3. On the interim application, it was argued that the construction is old and further the property is situated in unauthorized colony and as per the DDA notification dated 08.04.2026 is protected as on where is basis and therefore the interim protection should be granted till disposal of this appeal.

Contd…2/-

4. Ld counsel for the respondent on the other hand argued that the demolition order itself records that the appellant has 15 days time to get the property regularized after demolishing the non-compoundable deviations and therefore the period for limitation is only 15 days.
5. On the interim application it was argued that the appellant herself admits that the construction was raised without sanction and only because the property is in unauthorized colony, it cannot be protected unless and until the appellant get it regularized as per procedure.
6. I have perused the record. The appellant has challenged the demolition order dated 15.04.2025 passed in respect of unauthorized construction from ground to fourth floor in property no. C-41/2, (Part), Gali No. 3, North Ghonda, Delhi-110053. This demolition order as per track consignment report was served on 19.04.2025. The present appeal has been filed on 18.08.2026 after a delay of more than one year. The demolition order records that the appellant can file formal application within 15 days for regularization after demolishing non-compoundable

Contd…3/-

deviations. The appellant therefore had 15 days time from 19.04.2025 to get the property regularized or to challenge the demolition order.

7. The arguments of the appellant that the impugned order does not mention the period of filing appeal against the demolition order is without merits since ignorance of law is no excuse and further the order gave 15 days time to the appellant. The appeal therefore is highly belated as the delay in filing the appeal has not been explained. Record also show that even the show cause notice dated 26.03.2025 was duly served to the appellant on 29.03.2025 but the appellant did not bother to reply.
8. It was also argued for the appellant that the impugned order does not specify as to which part of property No. C-41/2, it has been passed. This arguments is also without merits as the show cause notice was served not only through post but also through pasting at the subject property and the identity of the subject property was never in dispute.
9. The delay of more than one year is unexplained and cannot be condoned. Reliance in this regard can be placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in **P.K. Ramchandran Vs. State of Kerala & Ors. 1997 (7) SCC 556**.

Contd…4/-

10. In view of the same, the application seeking condonation of delay is dismissed, as a result the appeal is also dismissed.
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
25.09.2026

A.No. 780/26

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Sugam Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Abheet Mangleek, 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 some time to file certain documents.

At request, put up for arguments on **07.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 871/26 & 872/26
Dalip Kumar Sharma Vs. MCD

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Rajat Aneja, Ld. Senior counsel for the appellant joined through VC along with Sh. Rishabh Jain, Adv.

Files are taken up today on the applications of the appellant seeking interim directions.

The respondent after the interim protection granted on 17.09.2026, has issued fresh show cause notice under Section 345-A of DMC Act on 18.09.2026.

The appellants have sought interim protection against any coercive action in pursuance to the fresh show cause notice, reply to which as stated for the appellant, has already been submitted yesterday.

Issue notice of the applications to the respondent for the date already fixed.

The respondent is restrained from sealing the property in pursuance to this fresh show cause notice. However, the proceedings u/s 345-A DMC Act may continue.

Put up on the date fixed i.e. **04.12.2026** for the purpose fixed.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 788/26

25.09.2026

Present : Ms. Khayati Bansal, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Jai Gupta, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent along with Sh. Krishan Kumar, AE(Civil).

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.

At request, put up for arguments on **03.12.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 899/26 & 636/25

25.09.2026

Present : Mohd. Elahi and Ms. Dimple, Ld. counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Jai Gupta, Ld. Proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent.

Arguments on behalf of the appellant heard.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Ashutosh Gupta is un-available today being busy before the Hon'ble High Court.

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 **11.01.2027.**

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 900/26

25.09.2026

Present : Ms. Lavisha Kamra, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC along with ld. proxy counsel. Memo of appearance filed.

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. counsel for the appellant seeks time to go through the status report and to inspect the record and to argue the matter.

At request, put up for arguments on the application seeking condonation of delay and appeal on **01.02.2027**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 42/26 (M)

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Pawan Kumar Sisodia, Sh. Vaibhav Sharma, Ld counsel for the applicant/R-2.

This is an application u/s 151 CPC filed by the respondent No.2 seeking urgent directions.

Heard.

Issue notice of this application to the appellant as well as respondent MCD for **23.10.2026.**

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 161/18

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Nikhil Bhola, ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Chirag Jamwal, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.
Sh. Ranjeet Pandey, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC.
Sh. Manish Choudhary, Sh. Jaidev Singh and Sh. Yogesh Bidhuri, Ld. counsels for the respondent no. 2 to 5 in person along with respondent no. 5 .

Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant seeks adjournment on the ground that the main counsel is not well today.

The counsel for the appellant and MCD have already advanced their arguments.

The proxy counsel for the appellant can note the submissions made by the respondent no. 5 for himself and respondents no. 2 to 4 and if required, can rebut on the next date of hearing.

Arguments on behalf of the respondent no. 2 to 5 heard and concluded.

Put up for arguments in rebuttal by the appellant on **28.10.2026**. Date has been given as per the convenience of the counsel for the appellant.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 290/20, 291/20 & 394/20

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. I.S. Chouhan and Sh. Deepak Grover, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent through VC.

An application under Order VII rule 14 CPC filed by the appellant to place on record the additional documents filed on the last date of hearing.

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

Part arguments heard.

At request, put up for further arguments on **30.11.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 47/22

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Ojas Singh Sachdev along with Sh. Chirag Madan, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Vasu Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC.

Further arguments heard.

Copy of the sanctioned building plan filed by the appellant. Let the copy of the same be supplied to the ld counsel for the respondent.

MCD is directed to file the report whether the sanctioned building plan filed today by the appellant relates to the entire plot measuring 476 sq. yards, bearing property no. C-4/6, Model Town-03, Delhi or is it only in respect of the rear portion of the property on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further arguments on **08.12.2026**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 585/22

25.09.2026

Present : Ms. Prerna Chaturvedi, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pulkit Garg, ld.proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel for the respondent.

Ld counsel for the respondent seeks some more time to file the status report as per the last order.

At request, put up for awaiting status report and arguments on **12.01.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 689/22, 175/23 & 176/23

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Manoj Kumar, ld. proxy counsel for the appellants joined through VC.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 689/22. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.
None for the respondent in appeals no. 175/23 & 176/23

It is stated for the appellant that the appellant has passed away on 01.07.2026 and steps will be taken to implead her legal heirs. A copy of the death certificate of the appellant filed in all the three appeals.

None has appeared for the respondent despite repeated calls in appeals no. 175/23 and 176/23. Fresh notice be issued to the MCD for ensuring the presence of the counsel on the next date of hearing.

Put up for further proceedings on **13.01.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 442/23

25.09.2026

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

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy placed on record. Let it be collected.

As per the status report, the subject property falls in 'G' category.

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

No adverse order is being passed today.

Put up for arguments on **18.01.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 802/23

25.09.2026

Present : Ms. Parul Agarwal, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent/MCD.
Dr. Anusuya, ld. counsel for R-3 along with R-3 in person.

Part arguments heard.

At request made by ld counsel for the appellant, put up for further arguments on **18.01.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 330/24

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Rishabh Gupta, Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant joined through VC.
Sh. Ravi Ranjan, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC. .
Sh. Nitin Kumar, ld. counsel for intervener.

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

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.

Put up for arguments on **05.02.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 336/24

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Ankush Narang , Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

None has appeared for the respondent despite repeated calls since morning and despite issuance of the notice.

Let a notice be issued to the CLO to appear in person with explanation and also for ensuring the presence of the counsel on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on **01.02.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 764/24
Sheela Devi Vs. MCD

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Ajit Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC.

Arguments heard.

The appellant has challenged demolition order dated 08.08.2024 passed in respect of unauthorized construction in the shape of ground and first floor of property at Khasra no. 31/12, Opposite Metro Pillar no. 886-A, C block, Bharat Vihar, Kakrola, New Delhi.

Amongst other grounds raised by the appellant, the appellant has also stated that her reply and documents were not considered and the impugned order is a non-speaking order.

Same has been opposed by the ld counsel for the respondent on the ground that the appellant did not file any document as none are available in the office record and there was no occasion for the Quasi Judicial Authority to consider the alleged documents.

I have gone through the impugned order which says that after dealing with all the submissions, pleas and defenses raised by the appellant as well as record and documents placed on record, the Quasi Judicial Authority is satisfied that the subject property is liable for action.

…contd.2

The details of the record and documents were not even discussed in the impugned order nor same are available in the office record of the MCD.

The appellant has placed on record her reply dated 10.07.2024 submitted before the Quasi Judicial Authority after the matter was remanded back on 30.05.2024 in the previous appeal no. 4/24 which was on the ground of non-service of show cause notice upon the appellant.

The impugned order, being a non-speaking order and without discussing and recording the reasons of rejecting the contentions and documents of the appellant, is liable to be set aside.

In these facts, the demolition order dated 08.08.2024 is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply dated 10.07.2024 and documents submitted by the appellant and after giving personal hearing to the appellant.

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 27.10.2026 at 3.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

….contd.3

With the 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
25.09.2026

A.No. 878/24
Bhawani Shankar and Ors. Vs. MCD

25.09.2026
Present : Ms. Deeksha Anand, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Mehak Arora, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard.

The appellant has challenged the demolition order dated 06.09.2024 passed in respect of unauthorized construction from basement to second floor in two properties no. 3/44 and 3/45, Block 3, Khichdi Pur, Delhi.

The prima ground for challenge to the impugned order is non-consideration of reply and not providing the opportunity of personal hearing.

Same has been opposed on the ground that show cause notice dated 23.08.2024 was duly served upon the appellants on 29.08.2024, but was replied only on 09.09.2024 whereas the demolition order was already passed on 06.09.2024 and there was no reason for the Quasi Judicial Authority to consider the reply received subsequent to the order.

The respondent posted the show cause notice dated 23.08.2024 on 28.08.2024 which provided only 3 days time to reply. The respondent itself waited for 5 days for posting the show cause notice and same was served on 29.08.2024. A period of 3 days to reply to a show cause notice seeking demolition of a property is unreasonable and insufficient.

Considering that the appellants are illiterate and did not get sufficient time to reply the show cause notice, the impugned demolition order 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.

The appellant shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on 28.10.2026 at 2.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

The appeal stands disposed of.

Record of the respondent, if any, 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
25.09.2026

A.No. 237/25

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. G.R. Verma , Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh Jai Gupta, Ld. proxy counsel for Ashutosh Gupta , Ld counsel for the respondent.
Intervener in person.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Ashutosh Gupta is un-available today being busy before the Hon'ble High 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 **18.01.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 249/25 & 623/25

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Anil Goel, Ld counsel for the appellant. in appeal No.249/25 joined through VC.
None for the appellant in appeal No.623/25
Sh. Sagar Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal No.249/25 joined through VC.
Sh. Jai Gupta, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 623/25.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Ashutosh Gupta is un-available today being busy before the Hon'ble High Court.

Put up for arguments on **11.01.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 469/25 & 470/25

25.09.2026

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

Reply to the application u/s 5 of Limitation Act is filed on behalf of the respondent. Copy supplied.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as as main counsel Sh. Avishek Kumar is not available today due to some personal exigency

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 **05.02.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 641/25
25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Abdul Basit, Ld counsel for the appellant along with appellant.
Sh. Jai Gupta, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel the respondent.
Sh. Manorajan, ld. counsel for the private respondents.
Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

Reply has been filed by the private respondents to the application of the appellant seeking urgent interim directions. Copy already supplied.

MCD has filed status report as per the last order stating that there is no non-compoundable deviation in the property.

The appellant has filed photograph of the subject property.

The MCD is directed to file current photographs with date of the subject property from all the four sides and specifically from the front side with sanctioned building plan/regularized plan if any, of the subject property to appreciate whether any non-compoundable deviations exists of not, on the next date of hearing.

Put up for awaiting status report and arguments on **14.12.2026**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 735/25

25.09.2026

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

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied. As per the status report, the regularization application of the appellant has already been rejected for non-compliance of Invalid notice.

On request, put up for arguments on **05.02.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 738/25

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Tarun Singla, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Vasu Singh, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Dalip Rastogi, ld. counsel for R-2 and R-3.

Ld counsel for the private respondent seeks a week's time to file the reply to the appeal and Misc. application.

Let the same be filed as last opportunity in a week with advance copy to the ld counsel for the appellant and respondent/MCD.

Rejoinder, if any, be also filed within a week after receiving the copy of reply with advance copy to the ld counsel for the private respondent and MCD.

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
25.09.2026

A.No. 764/25

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Rohit Jain, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Jai Gupta, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, counsel the respondent

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Ashutosh Gupta is held up before the Hon'ble High Court.

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

Put up for arguments on **01.02.2027.**

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 788/25 & 789/25

25.09.2026

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

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Avishek Kumar is not available today due to some personal exigency

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 **05.02.2027**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 70/26

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Ankit Negi, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC along with ld. proxy counsel.

Reply to the application seeking condonation of delay filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The appellant is ready to pay the misuser charges of the subject property with undertaking to not to use the same for any purposes other than those permissible under MPD-2021 and MPD-2047.

In view of the same, the respondent is directed to temporary deseal the property to calculate the misuser charges and inform the same to the appellant so that he can deposit the misuser charges on or before the next date of hearing.

Needful be done within 4 weeks from today.

Put up for further proceedings on **27.10.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 199/26 & 200/26

25.09.2026

Present : Ms. Nancy, ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Sanjay Sethi, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 199/26 joined through VC.
Ms. Sunita Sevda, ld. counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 200/26 joined through VC.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main arguing counsel Sh. Arush Kapoor is not available today due to ill-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.

Put up for arguments on **01.02.2027**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 315/26

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. Ravi Drall, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Anant Mishra, ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Yogesh Rai, Ld counsel for the respondent.
Sh. Armaan Monga, ld counsel for the interverner along with intervener.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the respondent as main counsel Sh. Yogesh Rai has been suffering from Swine-flu.

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.

The appellant does not want to file reply to the application under Order I rule 10 CPC.

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

…contd.2

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 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 arguments on the appeal on **02.02.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 331/26

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. R.K. Singh, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Jai Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Regularization application of the appellant is still pending and it is stated by the ld counsel for the appellant that a fresh Invalid notice dated 22.09.2026 has been received from the respondent which shall be complied in due course.

Be awaited for outcome of the regularization application and arguments on **07.01.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 456/26

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. G.C. Pandey, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC along with Sh. Piyush Kumar, Adv.
Sh. Atul Tanwar, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC along with ld. proxy counsel.

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

At request, put up for arguments on **05.02.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026

A.No. 568/26

25.09.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent joined through VC.
Sh. Mritunjay Kumar, ld counsel for the intervener.

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

An application under Order I rule 10 CPC filed on behalf of the intervener. Let the copy be supplied to the appellant as well as MCD.

Reply, if any, to this application be filed within 4 weeks with advance copy to the other side.

Put up for reply and arguments on this application under Order I rule 10 CPC and on appeal 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
25.09.2026

A.No. 609/25

25.09.2026

Present : Sh. O.P. Gupta, Ld counsel for the appellant joined through VC.

Sh. Jai Gupta, Ld proxy counsel for Sh. Ashutosh Gupta Ld counsel for the respondent.

Vide separate judgment of even date, the present 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
25.09.2026

A.No. 567/25
Manju Jana & Anr. Vs. MCD

25.09.2026

Present : None for the parties.

Matter be listed for judgment.

I have perused the record. The sale deed in favour of the appellant records at page-3 that the site plan of the subject property is annexed with the sale deed.

The appellant did not file the same. The appellant is directed to produce the original sale deed with site plan.

Further, the appellant has filed on record an assessment order in respect of the subject property but the same is not complete and only first and second pages of this order has been filed.

The appellant is directed to file complete assessment order filed as annexure A-4, (Colly).

Put up for further arguments on **18.01.2027**.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
25.09.2026