Case No. 334 of 2024

Premsukh & Ors.
Vs.
SDM Kapas Hera & Ors.

08.09.2025

Present : None for Petitioners.
: Shri Naveen Tyagi, Counsel for R-3.

1. Vide separate order, the case is disposed of.

2. File be consigned to record room after completion.

(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No. 92 of 2025

08.09.2025

Present : Mr. Rahul Jariyal, Counsel for Petitioner.
: None for Respondents.

1. The Petitioner contended that the present revision petition has been filed against the impugned order dated 05.08.2022 passed by RA/SO (C) and for quashing the proceedings pending before RA/SDM (Alipur). Petitioner further relied upon the two judgments one dated 30.11.2021 in WPC No.12038/2019 titled "Smt.Sushma Kapoor Vs. Govt of NCT of Delhi & Anr"and another dated 10.04.2023 in WPC No.3502/2022 titled "Rajeev Shah(deceased) through LRs Ms.Gayatri Shah Vs. Govt of NCT of Delhi & Ors." passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and contended that the pending proceedings cannot continue and to be declared non- est as the village Bakoli stands notified as L.D.R.A on 18.06.2013. The Petitioner sought interim protection by the court on the said impugned order but admitted that the revenue authorities have not yet given effect to the conditional order of 05.08.2022.

2. None appeared for Respondents. Respondents are directed to file their reply on the petition as well as stay application of the Petitioner within one week from today with an advance copy to the Petitioner.

3. Copy of this order be served upon the SDM through District Magistrate (North).

4. Adj. to 24.09.2025 for final arguments.

Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No. 20 of 2025

08.09.2025

Present : Ms. Nishtha Sinha, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri S.S Rana, Counsel for R-4.

1. Counsel for Petitioner sought time to argue the matter on issue of jurisdiction. Request of Petitioner is allowed and she is directed to come prepared to argue the matter on the next date of hearing.

2. Counsel for R-4 contended that this Court has no jurisdiction to hear revision petition filed against the order of Additional Director of Consolation/DM and only Writ Petition lies and filed copies of judgment bearing WP (C) No. 77/1957 dated 10.10.1962 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India titled "Roop Chand Vs State of Punjab" and bearing No. 4200/2008 dated 10.08.2011 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi titled "Dhani Ram (deceased) Through LRs Vs Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ors." in furtherance of his arguments.

3. Issue notices to the R-1, R-2 and R-3 to appear & lead the case on the next date of hearing and also to file reply with an advance copy to the Petitioner as well as R-4 within next 10 days.

4. Adj. to 24.09.2025 for final arguments.

Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No. 47 of 2025

08.09.2025

Present : Shri Manish Diwan, Counsel for Appellant.
: None for the Respondent.

1. Heard the Appellant.

2. The Appellant contended that the Competent Authority has not established the ownership of Mr. Rajiv Rathi (Respondent herein). The Appellant added further that he is 71 years old and he is occupying the impugned premises since 2017 and paying rent to the landlord regularly without any default and if he get evicted then the Appellant would not be able to search any alternative tenanted premises at the age of 71 years. The Competent Authority has not considered the point that the Respondent herein owns various properties including his own residential house and commercial premises. The Competent Authority passed the impugned order by way of ignoring the settled legal position laid down in the Slum Area (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956.

3. The Appellant further contended that the Respondent herein fails to show and file any document before the Competent Authority which proves that the Respondent is the actual owner of the tenanted premises.

4. The Appellant is directed to file his written submissions in brief, if he so wishes, latest by 18.09.2025 whereafter, orders shall be passed on the basis of the documents available on record.

5. Issue notice to the Respondent to file written arguments in brief, latest by 18.09.2025.

6. The case is reserved for pronouncement of orders on 07.10.2025.

Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No. 178, 179 and 180 of 2024

08.09.2025

Present : Shri Raju Rohtagi, Petitioner in case no. 178/2024 and P-1 in case no. 179/2024.
: None for Respondent in all three cases.

1. Petitioner sought time as the counsel is not available. Allowed with a cost of Rs. 1000/- each in all three cases to be paid to the DDO, General Administration Department (GAD), GNCTD before the next date of hearing. The petitioner is further directed to come prepared for arguments on the next date of hearing failing which, the matter may be dismissed for non-pursuance.

2. None appeared for the Respondent. Issue notice to the respondent to appear and lead the case on the next date of hearing.

3. Adj. to 16.09.2025 for arguments.

Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No. 365 of 2024

08.09.2025

Present : Shri Ashok Kumar, Petitioner in person.
: Shri Ankit Gupta, Counsel for R-1, Bank.
: Shri Sandeep Kumar, Section Officer for RCS.

1. Petitioner sought time to implead DJB & RCS and to file amended memo of parties as the Counsel is not available. It is seen that on the last two hearings i.e. 24.04.2025 and 23.05.2025, petitioner was directed to file amended memo of parties but the Petitioner failed to file the same. Accordingly, a cost of Rs. 1000/- is imposed on him to be paid to the Respondent, Jain Cooperative Bank Ltd. and the Petitioner is given final opportunity to file the amended memo of parties by impleading DJB & RCS before the next date of hearing failing which, the matter may be dismissed for non-pursuance.

2. Counsel for Respondent, Bank sought time to file judgments and other documents which permit the retirement benefits of concerned employee to be attached in recovery proceedings. Allowed.

3. Adj. to 03.10.2025.

Financial Commissioner
Delhi