A.No. 950/26

30.09.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

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

Submissions heard. File perused.

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

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

Put up for arguments on interim application(s) and appeal on **12.10.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 951/26
Himanshu Rohatgi Vs. MCD

30.09.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.
Present : Sh. Umang Tyagi, Sh. Sanyam Dahiya and Sh. Amulaya Upadhyay, 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 **07.01.2027**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. Flat no. 96, Karishma Apartment, IP Extension, New Delhi in pursuance of the demolition order dated 31.08.2026. 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 952/26
Raj Kumar Chauhan Vs. MCD

30.09.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Nitin 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 **04.12.2026**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. Flat no. 19-B, DDA Flat, Ber Sarai, New Delhi, in pursuance of the impugned order This interim order shall not come in the way of any order/directions passed by the Hon'ble High Court as well as Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. It is also made clear that no encroachment on the public land is protected. The appellant is directed not to raise any further construction in the property in question.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 954/26

30.09.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Appellant, who herself is an advocate, in person.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The appellant has not filed the site plan of the existing structure of the property in question.

The appellant is directed to file the site plan of the existing structure of the property in question with measurement on the next date of hearing.

Put up for consideration on **01.10.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 955/26
Ram Rikh Vs. MCD

30.09.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Madan Lal Sharma, Sh. Ashish Bhardwaj & Sh. Raghav Bansal, 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 **11.01.2027**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant i.e. bearing no. 81-C, Katwaria Sarai, New Delhi, in pursuance of the demolition order dated 09.09.2026. 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 956/26

30.09.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Rachit Khandelwal, Ms. Mimansa Vashistha and Ms. Aarchi Sharma, 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 **12.10.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 957/26
Om Nath Puri Vs. MCD

30.09.2026
Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.
Present : Sh. George Tomes, Sh. Vinay Singh and Ms. Aradhana Singh, 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 **08.01.2027**.

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken against the property of appellant bearing no. 866 only, Kedar Building, Ghantaghar, Delhi-110007 in pursuance of the demolition order dated 28.07.2026. 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 965/26

30.09.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Gaurav Kumar, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

The appellant does not file the site plan of the subject property.

The appellant is directed to file the site plan of the subject property with measurement.

At request, put up for consideration on **01.10.2026.**

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 966/26

30.09.2026

Fresh appeal received. It be checked and registered.

Present : Sh. Devender Singh Katara, Ld counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. File perused.

Ld. counsel for the appellant wants to file certain documents.

At request, put up for consideration on **05.10.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 459/26, 460/26, 461/26, 462/26, 463/26, 464/26, 465/26, 466/26, 467/26, 468/26, 469/26, 470/26, 471/26, 472/26, 473/26, 481/26, 482/26, 483/26, 488/26, 512/26 & 513/26

30.09.2026

Present : Sh. Rohit Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellants.

Sh. V.K. Aggarwal, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 462/26, 463/26, 464/26, 465/26, 467/26, 469/26, 471/26, 481/26, 482/26, 483/26, 488/26. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

Sh. Atul Kumar, ld counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 512/26 and 513/26. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

Sh. Madan Sagar,ld counsel for the respondent in appeals no. 460/26, 461/26, 466/26, 468/26 and 473/26. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

Sh. Yusuf Jawaid and Sh. Madhav Saraswat, Ld. counsels for the respondent in appeal no. 459/26 and 472/26. He submits that he will file the vakalatnama during the course of day.

Ms. Shivani Panwar, Ld. Proxy counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 470/26.

Sh. Anurag Shandilya, AE(B), NWZ, MCD.

Common status report is filed by the MCD, copy kept in appeal no. 459/26. Copy supplied.

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

The appellants have challenged the rejection of regularization application order dated 22.04.2026 and these appeals were filed on 29.04.2026 with a delay of 7 days. On oral request, the delay is condoned.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD/30.09.26

A.No. 813/26
Smt. Preeti & Ors. Vs. MCD

30.09.2026

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

Status report is filed by the MCD, copy supplied.

The aforesaid appeal is against the vacation notice dated, which is not appealable before this Tribunal.

At this stage, ld. counsel for the appellant submits that he has instructions from the appellants to withdraw the aforesaid appeal and he may be permitted to withdraw the aforesaid appeal with liberty to file fresh appeal against the sealing/demolition order.

At oral request made by the ld counsel for the appellant, the aforesaid appeal stands disposed off as withdrawn with liberty as prayed, as per law subject to law of limitation.

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

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 839/26

30.09.2026

Present : Sh. Amit Punj, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Abheet Mangleek, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Mohd. Asif, 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 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 **02.02.2027**.

There is no interim protection in the matter.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 868/26

30.09.2026

Present : Sh. Yati Ranjan, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Ms. Deepika Kumari, 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 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 **15.12.2026**.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 905/26

30.09.2026

Present : None for the appellant.
Ms. Sidhi Arora, Ld counsel for the respondent along with Sh. J.S. Khatri, AE(B). Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record

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

It is stated for the respondent that the record will be filed during the course of day.

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

At request, put up for awaiting record and arguments on **03.02.2027**.

There is no interim protection in the matter.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 937/26
Nand Gopal Gupta Vs. MCD

30.09.2026

Present : Dr. Gaurav Manuja along with Sh. Uttam Kumar and Sh. Akshya Dua, Ld counsels for the appellant.
Sh. Abheet Mangleek, Ld counsel for the respondent. Fresh Vakalatnama filed, same is taken on record.

Site plan filed by the appellant. Copy supplied.

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.

Reply to the application seeking condonation of delay filed

Arguments heard on the applications seeking condonation of delay of about 80 days in filing the aforesaid appeal. As per the appellant, he was not aware about the remedy of filing the appeal before this Tribunal and the earlier counsel did not so advised.

Without going into the merits of the submissions made and with an endeavour to decide the appeal on merits, the delay is condoned subject to deposit a cost of Rs. 5,000/- with the Registry.

The application stands disposed of.

At request, put up for arguments on appeal on **03.02.2027**.

…contd.2

Till next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken at the second and third floor of the property of appellant bearing no. A-98, Saraswati Vihar, Pitam Pura, Delhi as the appellant intends to get it regularized as per building bye-laws and the interim protection is granted only on this ground.

There is no protection to the stilt, ground, first and the terrace of the third floor of the property.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 1046/17
Pala Ram Vs. MCD

30.09.2026

Present : Sh. Nitin Sharma, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

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 appeal.

Statement of ld. counsel for the appellant recorded separately to this effect.

In view of the statement made by the ld. 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 201/24

30.09.2026

Present : Sh. G.R. Verma and Ms. Sonu Lohia, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

None has appeared for the respondent despite repeated calls and despite issuance of notice to the MCD.

No adverse order is being passed today.

Fresh notice be issued to the CLO, MCD for ensuring the presence of the counsel on the next date of hearing, failing which CLO will appear in person on the next date of hearing.

Put up for appearance of ld counsel for the respondent and 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
30.09.2026

At this stage, Sh. Akash Chaterjee, counsel for the respondent appeared through VC and he is apprised about today's order. In view of the appearance by the ld counsel for the respondent, let notice to the CLO be not issued.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 583/24

Nimmi Devi Vs. MCD

30.09.2026

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

Arguments heard. File perused.

The respondent has booked the unauthorized construction in the shape of ground and first floor in property no. F-112, Gali no. 10, West Jyoti Nagar, vide show cause notice dated 23.10.2017 followed by the demolition order which is 06.11.2017. The booking is only for the ground and first floor whereas even as per the affidavit and site plan filed by the appellant, there is some construction on the upper floors as well.

It appears that the said booking was done only on a High Court case without physically inspecting the property.

In these facts, the impugned demolition order is set aside with liberty to the MCD to book the property afresh as per law and considering the existing construction.

With above observation, 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 584/24 & 585/24

30.09.2026

Present : Sh. Alamgir, Ld. counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Nishant Walia, proxy counsel for Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent in appeal no. 584/24.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 585/24.

Record has not yet been submitted.

Ld counsel for the respondent seeks some time to file the same. Let the same be so filed and it can be inspected by the ld counsel for the appellant.

Put up for awaiting record and 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 586/24
Arvind Kumar Sharma Vs. MCD

30.09.2026
Present : Sh. Alamgir Ld. counsel for the appellant joined through VC.
None for the respondent

Arguments heard. File perused.

The property no. F-76, Gali no. 9, West Jyoti Nagar, Delhi, was booked vide show cause notice dated 23.10.2017 which was replied by the appellant on 07.11.2017 along with bunch of documents. The demolition order was passed on 06.11.2017 recording that no reply has been received till date.

Though, it is correct that the reply was received after passing of the demolition order, however, considering that there is no exact date as to when the show cause notice was received by the appellant, the demolition order dated 06.11.2017 is set aside with directions to the respondents to pass a speaking order after considering the reply dated 07.11.2017 and documents 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 3.00 pm and the speaking order be passed within 6 weeks of conclusion of the hearing.

….contd.2

With the above observation, 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 587/24
Ram Khilawan Yadav and Ors. vs. MCD
30.09.2026

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

Arguments heard.

This is an appeal challenging the demolition order dated 06.11.2017 passed in respect of unauthorized construction in the shape of ground to fourth floor with projections on the municipal land in property no. F-84, Gali no. 9, West Jyoti Nagar, Delhi.

The appellant has claimed protection under National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provision) Second Amendment Act, 2011 by claiming that the construction was raised prior to 08.02.2007 and has relied upon an electricity bill in the name of erstwhile owner Mr. Satyapal showing the date of energization as 11.07.1997. Apart from this document, there is no document of the subject property prior to the cut-off date of protection which is 08.02.2007.

Record shows that Mr. Satyapal purchased a build up property consisting of two rooms, kitchen, bathroom and toilet with boundary wall on 14.10.1999. The property as on date is consisting of ground plus four floors. The site plan shows that as on date at the ground floor, the construction is of parking space in front of about 20 x 15

…contd.2

feet and thereafter, a toilet and a room which is totally different from the built-up construction when Mr. Satyapal purchased the property.

The construction has been raised from ground to fourth floor after demolishing the old structure without any sanctioned building plan and there is no document to show that it was constructed prior to 08.02.2007.

In view of these facts, the appeal 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 588/24
Sajjan Kaur Vs. MCD
30.09.2026

Present : Sh. Alamgir, Ld. counsel for the appellant joined through VC.
Sh. Nishant Lohia, proxy counsel for Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent.

Arguments heard. File perused.

The respondent has booked the unauthorized construction in the shape of ground and first floor in property no. F-109, Gali no. 10, West Jyoti Nagar, vide show cause notice dated 23.10.2017 followed by the demolition order which is 06.11.2017. The booking is only for the ground and first floor whereas even as per the affidavit and site plan filed by the appellant, there is some construction on the upper floors as well.

It appears that the said booking was done only on a High Court case without physically inspecting the property.

In these facts, the impugned demolition order is set aside with liberty to the MCD to book the property afresh as per law and considering the existing construction.

With above observation, 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 589/24

30.09.2026

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

Part arguments heard.

The appellant is directed to file the property tax return of the subject property for the year 2006-07 and also latest PTR.

At request, 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 590/24
Shakuntala Devi vs. MCD

30.09.2026

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

Arguments heard. File perused.

The respondent booked the property no. F-87, Gali no. 9, West Jyoti Nagar, vide show cause notice and FIR dated 23.10.2017 issued in the name of Tejram Yadav.

The show cause notice as well as demolition order were sent through speed post in the name of Tejram Yadav. The show cause notice was replied by the appellant on 07.11.2017 and thereafter, a notice for personal hearing was again issued in the name of Tejram Yadav. There is no material to show that how Tejram Yadav is related to subject property.

In these facts, the demolition order dated 06.11.2017 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.

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.

…contd.2

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
30.09.2026

A.No. 591/24
Rashu Verma vs. MCD

30.09.2026

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

Arguments heard. File perused.

The respondent has booked the unauthorized construction in the shape of ground and first floor in property no. F-97, Gali no. 10, West Jyoti Nagar, vide show cause notice dated 23.10.2017 followed by the demolition order which is 06.11.2017. The booking is only for the ground and first floor whereas even as per the affidavit and site plan filed by the appellant, there is some construction on the upper floors as well.

It appears that the said booking was done only on a High Court case without physically inspecting the property.

In these facts, the impugned demolition order is set aside with liberty to the MCD to book the property afresh as per law and considering the existing construction.

With above observation, 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 592/24
Anirudh Kumar Sharma Vs. MCD

30.09.2026
Present : Sh. Alamgir, Ld. counsel for appellant joined through VC.
Sh. H.R. Aggarwal, ld counsel for the respondent

Arguments heard. File perused.

The respondent has booked the unauthorized construction in the shape of ground and first floor in property no. F-77, Gali no. 9, West Jyoti Nagar, vide show cause notice dated 23.10.2017 followed by the demolition order which is 06.11.2017. The booking is only for the ground and first floor whereas as per the regularization application and existing structure shown in the site plan with the regularization application, there is some construction on the upper floors as well.

It appears that the said booking was done only on a High Court case without physically inspecting the property.

In these facts, the impugned demolition order is set aside with liberty to the MCD to book the property afresh as per law and considering the existing construction.

With above observation, 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 593/24

30.09.2026

Present : Sh. Alamgir, Ld. counsel for the appellant joined through VC.
Sh. Nishant Lohia, proxy counsel for Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent.

Part arguments heard.

The appellant is directed to file PTR form of 2006-07 and latest PTR.

Put up for filing of PTR form and 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 594/24
Akash Tyagi Vs. MCD

30.09.2026

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

Arguments heard. File perused.

The respondent has booked the unauthorized construction in the shape of ground and first floor in property no. F-106, Gali no. 10, West Jyoti Nagar, vide show cause notice dated 23.10.2017 followed by the demolition order which is 06.11.2017. The booking is only for the ground and first floor whereas even as per the affidavit,, sale deed and site plan filed by the appellant, there is some construction on the upper floors as well.

It appears that the said booking was done only on a High Court case without physically inspecting the property.

In these facts, the impugned demolition order is set aside with liberty to the MCD to book the property afresh as per law and considering the existing construction.

With above observation, 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 648/24 & 1073/24

30.09.2026

Present : Sh. Sourav Ghosh, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 648/24.
Sh. Nishant Lohia, Ld. proxy counsel for Sh. Pritish Sabharwal, Ld. counsel for respondent in appeal no. 1073/24.
Sh. Rahul Dev Tyagi, ld. counsel for the applicant/intervener joined through VC.

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

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

Part arguments heard on the application seeking condonation of delay.

The respondent is directed to file status report as to how the show cause notice under Section 345-A DMC Act dated 30.12.2022 and the show cause notice dated 09.12.2022 under Section 344/343 DMC Act and the demolition order dated 21.12.2022 were served upon the appellant/her husband Imran Ali, on next date of hearing.

Put up for awaiting the status report and further arguments on this application as well as application under Order I rule 10 CPC 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 695/24

30.09.2026

Present : Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

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

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

At request, put up for arguments on **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
30.09.2026

A.No. 352/25
Rajesh Vohra Vs. MCD

30.09.2026

Present : Ms. Priyanka Kumari, Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought on behalf of the appellant as main counsel Sh. Jitin Sahni has been suffering with fever and is not able to come to the court.

File perused.

The aforesaid appeal is against the vacation notice dated 07.04.2025, which is not appealable before this Tribunal. The appellant is seeking adjournment to argue on this aspect since 04.07.2025 on one pretext or other.

The appeal, which is not appealable and maintainable before this Tribunal, is dismissed with liberty to challenge the demolition/sealing order as per law.

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
30.09.2026

A.No. 196/26
Sweta Jain and Anr. Vs. MCD

30.09.2026
Present : Sh. Ram Jeevan, Ld counsel for the appellant.
None for the respondent.

Arguments heard. File perused.

The appellant has challenged the sealing order dated 23.01.2026 passed in respect of unauthorized construction in the shape of fixing shutters at ground floor in property number 1929, gali Mata Wali, Katra, Kushal Rai, Kinari Bazar, Chandni Chowk, Delhi-110006.

As per the appellant, they purchased the two shops at ground floor vide registered sale deeds dated 01.05.2025 with the shutters already fixed in the shops and same has been booked without inspection and verification and the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

I have perused the record.

The appellants purchased these two shops on 01.05.2025 from Mr. Pawan Kumar Jindal, who had purchased the shops on 22.03.2007 from the erstwhile owner. There is no material in MCD record to show that the shutters have been fixed afresh by the appellants. Otherwise also fixing of shutters in the existing shops does not amount to unauthorized construction. The respondent itself has recorded in the impugned order that

…..contd.2

the property is old and occupied and only because there is no sanctioned building plan of the property, the fixing of shutters is unauthorized.

The impugned sealing order is set aside. Let the property be desealed within 2 weeks.

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
30.09.2026

A.No. 273/26 & 274/26

30.09.2026

Present : Sh. Samaan Vardhan Gautam and Sh. Rohan Jaitley, counsel for the appellant joined through VC.
Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

An adjournment is sought by the counsel for the appellant as he has recently been engaged and seeks some time to file vakalatnama.

MCD was directed by Hon'ble High Court to decide the regularization application of the appellant within 15 days from 05.08.2026.

Today the MCD has filed status report as which the regularization application of the appellant has been rejected on 24.09.2026. Copy of the said status report is placed on record. Let the same be collected.

The respondent was directed vide order dated 25.05.2026 to demolish the entire construction at fourth floor. Let the Action taken report in pursuance of this order be filed by the respondent/MCD on next date of hearing with an explanation from the DC concerned as to why no action has been taken in pursuance of this order till date, if not already taken.

Put up for arguments on **04.12.2026**.

Copy of this order be given dasti as requested.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD/30.9.26

A.No. 316/26 : Madhu Seth Vs. MCD
A.No. 317/26 : Sunil Seth Vs. MCD

30.09.2026

Present : Sh. Manu Sisodia, Ld counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Amit Kumar , Ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 316/26.
Sh. Adil Khan, ld counsel for the respondent in appeal no. 317/26.

Arguments heard.

1. These are two appeals challenging the common demolition order dated 24.03.2026 in respect of the unauthorized construction in the shape of deviations against sanctioned building plan no. 439/D/WZ/08/II dated 08.09.2008 at basement, ground, first and second floor in continuation of previous booking dated 17.11.2025 in appeal no. 316/26 for the second floor and in appeal no. 317/26 for the first floor in respect of property bearing no. B-1/170, Janak Puri, New Delhi.
2. The appellants are concerned only about the first and second floor of this property. They have challenged the demolition order on several grounds including that the show cause notice dated 23.02.2026 does not mention about the alleged deviations at first and second floor of the property as compared to sanctioned building plan and the appellants did not get proper opportunity to reply to the show cause

Contd…2/-

notice which is in violation of the directions given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the judgment of IN RE… directions in the matter of demolition of structures (2025) 5 Supreme Court Cases 1.

3. The ld counsels for the respondent on the other hand argued that the said deviations and excess coverage are specifically mentioned in the demolition order dated 24.03.2026. The appellants have constructed balconies which do not match with sanctioned building plan, the stairs from ground to third floor are undersized and the shaft area has been covered from ground to top floor and therefore the appellants had knowledge about the said deviations and excess coverage.

4. I have perused the record. The show cause notice dated 23.02.2026 does not mention about the deviations and excess coverage mentioned in the impugned demolition order. The appellants replied to the show cause notice without being aware about the alleged deviations/excess coverage which were spelt out only in the demolition order. Further, even the demolition order does not specify the extent of balconies which do not match with sanctioned building plan nor it states about the size of the stair case. The

Contd…3/-

demolition order though mentions the deviations but it does not mention the details in respect of the measurements.

5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the judgment IN RE… directions in the matter of demolition of structures (2025) 5 Supreme Court Cases 1, specifically directed that the Quasi Judicial Authority shall specified the details of the unauthorized construction in the show cause notice and the concerned persons should be given ample opportunity to reply in respect of the said unauthorized construction.
6. In the present case, the show cause notice dated 23.02.2026 is completely silent regarding the details of the deviations/excess coverage against sanctioned building plan dated 08.09.2008 and the appellants were not given suitable opportunity to reply to the show cause notice.
7. In these facts, the demolition order dated 24.03.2026 is set-aside and the respondent is directed issue fresh show cause notice giving details of the deviations with measurements of the balconies, undersized stair case, shaft at ground floor and iron jaal at rear open area and thereafter pass fresh speaking demolition order after complying with principles of natural justice.

Contd…4/-

8. The appellants shall appear before the Quasi Judicial Authority on **28.10.2026 at 3.00 pm** for receiving the detailed show cause notice.
9. The appeals stand disposed of.
10. 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 442/26 and 443/26

30.09.2026

Files are taken up on an urgent application filed by the appellant seeking compliance of the interim order dated 29.05.2026 and 24.09.2026.

Present : Ms. Vandana Kaushal, Ld. counsel for the appellant.

Submissions heard. Perused.

Issue notice of this application to the respondent for the date fixed i.e 08.01.2027 and it is specified that the respondent has been restrained from taking any coercive action against the property of the appellant i.e. bearing no. D-23, D Block, Khanpur Extension, New Delhi in pursuance of the demolition orders dated 17.10.2025 and 05.01.2026.

The respondent is also directed to furnish the explanation as to why action has been taken against this property despite interim protection on 29.09.2026, on the date fixed.

Copy of this order be given dasti as requested.

(AMIT KUMAR)
Addl. District & Sessions Judge
P.O.: Appellate Tribunal, MCD
30.09.2026

A.No. 150/18 & 373/18

30.09.2026

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

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

Further arguments heard.

Vide separate common judgment of even date, both the aforesaid appeals are 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
30.09.2026

A.No. 611/24

30.09.2026

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

Sh. Ashutosh Gupta, Ld counsel for the respondent.

The respondent has not submitted the record.

Let the same be submitted. The appellant has not filed the site plan of the existing structure nor there is any status report of MCD in respect of the existing structure. The appellant is directed to file site plan of existing structure with details of rooms etc. on each floor.

The respondent is also directed to physically inspect the property and file status report with measurements of rooms etc. existing on each floor of the subject property.

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
30.09.2026