

**Case No. 173 & 174 of 2021**

11.04.2025

Present : Shri Devanshu Sharma, Counsel for Petitioner in both cases.  
: Shri O.P. Bhowal, Plant Manager for Petitioner, Badli Industrial Area, CETP in case no. 173/2021.  
: Shri Hitesh Sharma, Plant Manager for Petitioner, Mayapuri Industrial Area CETP Society, in case no. 174/2021.  
: Shri Varun Gupta, Proxy Counsel for Respondent in both cases.

1. Quorum is not complete due to administrative reasons.
2. Since this matter is already pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, it is adjourned sine-die.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 352 of 2024**

11.04.2025

Present : Shri Vineet Kumar, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Abhishek Kumar, Counsel for R-2.  
: Ms. Harshita Maheshwari, Proxy Counsel for R-1  
along with Shri R. Suman, EE, DSIIDC.

1. Quorum is not complete due to administrative reasons. Hence the matter is adjourned.
2. Adj. to 09.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 55 of 2025**

11.04.2025

Present : Shri Akshay Bhardwaj, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Vinod Sharma, Proxy Counsel for R-1, Society.

1. The R-1 filed reply and copy given to the Petitioner.  
The matter is now fixed for final arguments. In the meantime, notice be issued to Respondent RCS.
2. Adj. to 02.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 253 of 2024**

11.04.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Sharma, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Ms. Vibhuti Jain, Proxy Counsel for Respondent,  
RCS.

1. Respondent, RCS is given final opportunity to file the reply.
2. Adj. to 08.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 48 of 2025**

11.04.2025

Present : Shri Vaibhav Rana, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: None for Respondent.

1. The Petitioner to file the tracking report of the service of notice so that the matter can proceed.
2. Adj. to 02.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case Nos. : 304 of 2024, 306 of 2024, 307 of 2024 & 308 of 2024**

11.04.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Petitioners (in all the cases).

: None for Respondent (in all the cases).

1. The Petitioners to implead the Revenue Department as a party and have the notices served so that the matter can proceed. Also notices be issued to the other Respondents.
2. Adj. to 22.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 66 of 2025**

11.04.2025

Present : Shri Nitin Prakash, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: None for Respondent, DGHS.

1. The Petitioner to file service of notice. In the meantime issue notice from the court, since the Ld.Counsel for Petitioner submits that the notices have been served.
2. Adj. to 22.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 171 of 2024**

11.04.2025

Present : Shri Akshay Bhardwaj, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri B.K. Mishra, Counsel for R-2, Bestway Cooperative Society.

1. The Petitioner was not prepared for the matter today. Consequently, the matter is now adjourned to 23.05.2025. On the next date, in case the Petitioner is not fully prepared with the matter, the interim order shall be vacated.
2. Adj. to 23.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 340 of 2024**

11.04.2025

Present : Shri Raj Kumar Sharma, Counsel for Appellant.  
: Shri Gautam Chakravarty, Counsel for R-1 & R-2.

1. Heard the parties.
2. Both the parties are directed to file their written submissions alongwith citations, if any, in support of their averments in the next four weeks, whereafter orders shall be passed on the basis of documents available on record.
3. The case is reserved for pronouncement of orders on 23.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case Nos. 34 of 2025 & 35 of 2025**

11.04.2025

Present : Shri S.K. Maniktala, Counsel for Appellant (in both the cases).

: Ms. Ruchika Rathi, Counsel for Respondent, DSIIDC/Industries Department (in both the cases).

1. Heard the parties.
2. The Appellant filed the documents as directed by the court on the last occasion. The Respondent to file the same qua the number of cases where after cancellation, plot has reverted back physically to the Department that is to say, where the possession has been taken over physically. This information be given by the Department from 1998 (year of cancellation of the Appellant's plot) till date. Similarly, the policy as prevailing since 1998 till date for dealing with cases of mis-use, cancellation and restoration also be filed separately so that this matter can be decided. These documents to be filed by the Respondent before the next date of hearing on which date the arguments shall be heard.
3. The Appellant also referred to the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in WPC No.7047/2014 & 10059/2020 where reference has been made to a policy for transfer/regularization/restoration/lease hold rights. The Respondent to clarify as to whether such policy existed when this case was decided by the Hon'ble High Court and if so why the same policy cannot be applied now.
4. Some of the cases where industrial plots were recommended for restoration by the Department after having been cancelled on account of mis-use,

unauthorized transfer etc. as filed by the Petitioner as part of the petition vide minutes of meeting of I.L.M.A.C. were also brought to the notice of the Respondent for address during arguments. A point being made by the Petitioner was that similarly placed cases were being handled dissimilarly by the Department/DSI IDC

5. All these shall be heard as a part of the final arguments.
6. Adj. to 09.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

11.04.2025

Mentioned today by Akshay Bhardwaj, Counsel for Petitioner.

1. The matter was mentioned and heard.
2. The Petitioner is aggrieved by the recovery certificate issued by the executing court attaching the salary of the Petitioner. The Petitioner is particularly aggrieved as the arbitration Award fixed the liability of repayment on the principal debtor first and only subsequently on the surety. The Petitioner being the surety argues that since the principal debtor is already before the executing court and has deposited some money (Rs.2 lakhs) and has filed an affidavit to settle the remaining, the Petitioner need not be proceeded against. The Petitioner is also aggrieved that the quantum of interest i.e. 16+3% is not as per law and seeks protection.
3. In view of the prayers of the Petitioner, the matter needs to be heard and the Petitioner deserves to be protected till the next date of hearing. Therefore, no coercive action qua the Petitioner in terms of the recovery orders be taken till the next date of hearing.
4. Issue dasti notice to the Respondent on filing of PF & RC by the Petitioner.
5. As requested by the Ld.Counsel for Petitioner, a copy of this order be given dasti.
6. Adj. to 23.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

11.04.2025

Mentioned today by Rajesh Srivastava, Counsel for Petitioner.

1. The matter was mentioned and heard.
2. The Petitioner is aggrieved with the inspection order passed by Registrar, Cooperative Societies under Section 61 of the Delhi Cooperative Societies Act, 2003. The Petitioner is aggrieved that this inspection has been ordered by the RCS with reference to an old complaint which has already been gone into details and the findings of the then Additional RCS were available to the RCS from the year 2021 where all the allegations were found to be not valid. Thereafter, the said complaint was looked into by the Directorate of Vigilance (DOV), GNCTD. As per impugned order dated 19.03.2025, the Directorate of Vigilance has recommended in-depth examination in case of financial mis-management and irregularities in loan transactions and recruitment mal-practices. The Petitioner's particular objection is that the said recommendation on the report of the Directorate of Vigilance is not made available to the Petitioner. The Petitioner further submits that there is no such report available with the Registrar as well.
3. The absence of the availability of such report on the file of the Registrar, as per the information of the Petitioner, is the ground which the Petitioner presents to seek interim protection from the said inspection. The Petitioner's case is also that the original complainant is not covered in terms of Section 61 of the DCS Act, 2003 since he is not a creditor or a member of the society.

4. Be that as it may, since the impugned orders are specifically referring to the existence of a recommendation particularly of the Directorate of Vigilance and the existence of significant irregularities, this court does not consider it just & fair to hold back action on the inspection report at this stage. The prayer for interim protection is therefore denied.
5. Seeing the circumstances, however, the interests of justice would be met if notices are issued so that the Petitioner's grievance is atleast heard before this court.
6. Issue dasti notices on filing of PF & RC by the Petitioner.
7. Adj. to 30.05.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**