

**Case No. 265 & 266 of 2024**

01.09.2025

Present : None for Petitioner.  
: None for Respondent.

1. Vide common separate order, the cases are disposed of.
2. Files be consigned to record room after completion.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 320 of 2024**

01.09.2025

Present : Mr.A.H. Khan, Counsel for Appellants.  
: None for Respondents.

1. The Appellant's appeal bearing No.297/2017 was dismissed by this Court on 20.07.2023. Aggrieved by the order, he filed review petition No.200/2023, which was also dismissed for non-prosecution. The Appellants filed restoration application (bearing No.263/2024). The same was also dismissed on 04.10.2024 by this court for non-prosecution. The Applicant again filed present restoration application No.320/2024 before this court. The Appellants are aggrieved by the impugned order dated 10.10.2017 passed by the Competent Authority (DUSIB) whereby the application filed by Applicants regarding permission to grant to initiate eviction proceedings against Respondents was allowed.
2. Counsel for Appellants sought short adjournment as he was not well prepared to argue the matter. Allowed.
3. Appellants are given one final opportunity to be represented appropriately failing which their case may be dismissed for non-prosecution. The court will hear arguments on merits of review on the next date of hearing.
4. Adj. to 09.09.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 88 of 2025**

01.09.2025

Present : Shri Harshad Gupta, Proxy Counsel for Restoration Applicant.  
: Shri Deepak Singh, Proxy Counsel for R-1.  
: Shri Ujjawal Gupta, Counsel for R-2.

1. The Appellant filed appeal (bearing No.12/2025) under Section 20 of the Slum Area (Improvement and Clearance), Act, 1956 against the impugned order dated 16.04.2024 by R-1/DUSIB herein. The said appeal was dismissed by this court on 17.04.2025 for non-prosecution. Aggrieved by the order, the Applicant filed Restoration Application (bearing No.88/2025.) before this court.
2. The Proxy Counsel for Appellant appeared today and sought adjournment as the main counsel is not available. Allowed.
3. A cost of Rs.1,000/- is imposed on the Appellant for not pursuing the matter diligently. The cost is to be payable to R-2. The Appellant is directed to submit the receipt of payment before this court on the next date of hearing.
4. Subject to payment of cost, one final opportunity is given to the Appellant to be represented appropriately on the next date of hearing failing which the matter may be dismissed for non-prosecution.
5. The Appellant is also directed to provide copy of petition to the Respondents.
6. Adj. to 22.09.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 87 of 2025**

01.09.2025

Present : None for Petitioner.  
: None for Respondent.

1. None appeared for Petitioner.
2. One final opportunity is given to the Petitioner to appear and lead the case on the next date of hearing failing which the case may be dismissed for non-prosecution. Issue notice to Petitioner with directions to come prepared to argue on maintainability of the case before this court.
3. Issue notice to the Respondent, Tehsildar (Najafgarh) to appear on the next date of hearing and file reply.
4. Adj. to 10.09.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

## **Case No. 352 of 2024**

01.09.2025

Present : Shri Vineet Kumar Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Abhishek Kumar, Counsel alongwith Ms. Twinkle Kataria, Counsel for R-2.

1. The Respondent No.2 M/s. PNC Delhi Industrial Inra Pvt. Ltd. filed reply to the Appellant's application filed under Order VI Rule 17 CPC R/s Section 13(3) of Delhi Common Effluent Treatment Plants Act, 2000 which is taken on record and copy of the same is given to the Appellant.
2. The Respondent contested that the amendment application filed by Appellant is not maintainable as Section 13(3) of the CETP Act does not allow Appellant to seek amendment in an appeal already filed before this Court and the provisions of CPC are not applicable.
3. The contention of the Respondent is not acceded to and the amendment application is allowed since the notification dated 07.04.2025 of the DSIIDC is a continuation (for subsequent financial years) of the original notification dated 10.11.2023 which was disputed in the original appeal petition. Both the notifications relate to CETP and Sewerage charges. Nothing would be gained by multiple appeal proceedings when the subject matter is identical.
4. R-1 DSIIDC is absent. Issue notice to DSIIDC through MD of DSIIDC to be present on the next date of hearing without fail and file reply.
5. Adj. to 06.10.2025.

**(Bhupesh Kumar)**  
Chief Engineer  
(SDW) NW  
Delhi Jal Board  
**Member**

**(Manorama Rawat)**  
Deputy Controller of  
Accounts  
**Member**

**(Prashant Goyal)**  
Financial Commissioner  
Delhi  
**Chairperson**

**Case No. 37 of 2025**

01.09.2025

Present : Shri Prajwal Sharma, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Sumit Goyal Counsel alongwith Hemant Goyal  
for R-1 Gram Sabha Surhera.

1. Counsel for Petitioner contended that there was a typographical mistake in memo of parties whereby the name of village was written Surhera instead of Roshanpura. Accordingly, Petitioner filed amended memo of parties to this effect. Allowed. The same is taken on record.
2. Since the said village 'Roshanpura' is urbanized vide Notification dated 16.05.2017 passed under Section 507 of the DMC Act, 1957. Accordingly, the petitioner should make a clear case on next date of hearing as to why the revision petition is maintainable before this Court.
3. Issue notice to R-2 to appear and defend their case on the next date of hearing.
4. Adj. to 24.09.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 66 of 2025**

01.09.2025

Present : Shri Tushar, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Mukesh Kumar, Counsel for Respondent,  
DGHS.

1. Case is passed over.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

Case is again taken up at 11.35 a.m.

Present : Shri Tushar, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Mukesh Kumar, Counsel for Respondent,  
DGHS.

2. Petitioner has sent the copy of the petition to the Respondent through WhatsApp today.
3. Respondent, DGHS is directed to file reply before the next date of hearing with an advance copy to the Petitioner. Respondent will also intimate the action taken as yet since there is no stay in the matter.
4. Adj. to 06.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 80 of 2025**  
**Minda Capital Pvt. Ltd.**  
**Vs.**  
**Additional Collector/A.D.M (New Delhi) & Anr.**

01.09.2025

Present : Shri S. S. Rana, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Sumit Goyal Counsel alongwith Hemant Goyal,  
ASO for R-2, G.S.

1. Heard the parties.
2. Counsel for petitioner contended that he has invoked the revisional powers of this Court u/s 187 for quashing the pending proceedings before the Collector/DC (New Delhi), on the ground that village 'Ghitorni' stood urbanized on 20.11.2019 whereafter the revenue authorities cease to have jurisdiction in view of the judgment dated 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2023 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled "***Mohinder Singh (Dead) through LRs and Another Vs. Narain Singh and Others***". He also submitted that the said village 'Ghitorni' is also covered by the LDRA notification dated 18.06.2013 which shall have the same effect as that of urbanization, in view of various orders of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.
3. None is present for R-1, ADM (New Delhi) despite notice.
4. The Counsel for the R-2, Gram Sabha contended that the present revision petition is pre-mature also the DC/Collector has not passed any order.
5. Keeping in view, the pendency of the appeal before the DC, the case is remanded back to the Collector/DC (New Delhi) with a direction to dispose of the pending appeal within a period of 90 days from today. Keeping in view the fact that the area stands covered by LDRA notification dt. 18.06.2013 as well as urbanization notification dt. 20.11.2019 after which the revenue authorities cease to have jurisdiction in wake of the various judgments from

the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

6. Accordingly, the case bearing no. 80/2025 titled ***Minda Capital Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Additional Collector/A.D.M (New Delhi) & Anr.*** is remanded back to the ADM (New Delhi).
7. File be consigned to record room after completion.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 81 of 2025**

01.09.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Kumar, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Sumit Goyal Counsel alongwith Hemant Goyal,  
ASO for Respondent, Gram Sabha Singhu.

1. Petitioner contended that the said village 'Singhu' stands covered by the LDRA Notification dated 18.06.2013 and subsequently urbanized vide Notification dated 20.11.2019 passed under Section 507 of the DMC Act, 1957. Accordingly, the impugned pending proceedings have become non-est.
2. Written submission filed by the Respondent, Gram Sabha is already on record.
3. The order dated 18.05.2001 passed by the SDM is pending before the ADM (North). The petitioner is not able to furnish any documentary evidence to the effect that the matter of LDRA notification and urbanization notification were brought to the notice of ADM, and what is decision of ADM thereon. Petitioner is given one final opportunity to file additional documents to respond to the query of this Court.
4. Adj. to 01.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 87 of 2025**

01.09.2025

Present : Shri, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri, Counsel for R-.

1. Counsel for Petitioner stated that
2. Counsel for R- stated that
3. Adj. to .2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 233 of 2024**

01.09.2025

Present : Shri Sarthak Sethi, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Mukesh Kumar, Counsel for Respondent,  
DGHS.

1. Counsel for Appellant claimed that all the deficiencies raised by the DGHS in the cancellation orders of link officer, DGHS dt. 05.07.2024 have since been addressed and he should be allowed to continue his business. The respondent admitted that if the deficiencies have indeed been removed, the appellant should apply for a fresh license to DGHS. He was however unable to explain as to what will DGHS do with the Nursing Home in the interregnum and what will be gain from availing fresh registration. He is directed to seek detailed instruction from DGHS and defend on the next date of hearing.
2. Meanwhile the appellant may approach DGHS and apprise him of the latest status of the Nursing Home and seek relief available under law. DGHS may pass appropriate orders thereon.
3. Interim orders to continue till the next date of hearing.
4. Adj. to 06.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**