

Case No. 312 of 2024

10.09.2025

Present : Shri Deepak Khosla, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Vinod Kumar, Proxy Counsel for R-1 & R-2.
: Shri Ajit Kumar, Proxy Counsel for R-3, SDM (Narela).

1. Counsel for R-1 & R-2 sought time for arguments as the main Counsel is not available today.
2. One final opportunity is given to the R-1 & R-2 to appear either through his Counsel or in person for arguments on merit on the next date of hearing.
3. Issue notice to R-3, SDM through Deputy Commissioner (North).
4. Adj. to 15.10.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 23 of 2025
Navbharat Times CGHS Ltd.
Vs.
Registrar Cooperative Societies & Ors.

10.09.2025

Present : None for Petitioner.
: Shri Vishesh, Sr. Assistant for R-1, RCS.
: Shri G.L. Verma, Counsel for R-2.

1. None appeared for the Petitioner although date was fixed for arguments.
2. The Counsel for R-2 submitted that R-2 purchased a flat in society in the year 1992 and membership was transferred and Membership, Share Certificate and NOC were issued to R-2 by then MC on G.P.A. and he is the member of the Society.
3. It is noted that R-1, RCS mentioned in its reply in para No.7 that the DCT passed an order dated 27.01.2025 vide which it is stated that Sh.Verma (Advocate on behalf of Rahul Hajela) submitted that document executed on 30.08.2015 specifically the GPA already stands cancelled by way of registered cancellation deed dated 29.12.2023. Further, R-2 has relied upon the Judgment of Apex Court dated 11.11.2011 in case titled "Suraj Lamp & Industries (P) Ltd. Tr. Dir Vs. State of Haryana & Anr." stating that the property sale prior to 2011 on GPA is valid but only registered sale deed is allowed thereafter.
4. The Counsel for R-2 categorically stated before this court that the appeal filed by the Petitioner before the DCT is still pending, meanwhile the Petitioner has still approached this court. R-2 also stated that the Petitioner has not filed any appeal under Rule 20(4) of the DCS Rules before RCS instead they filed revision petition before this court. Therefore, this petition is not maintainable as the Petitioner cannot approach two forums on the same matter.
5. There is merits in arguments of R-2. Accordingly, the revision petition No.23/2025, is dismissed.
6. File be consigned to the record room, after completion.

(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No. 40 of 2025

10.09.2025

Present : None for Appellant.
: Shri Mukesh Kumar, Counsel for R-1, DGHS.

1. None appeared for Appellant.
2. Final opportunity is given to the Appellant to appear either in person or through his Counsel to lead the matter on the next date of hearing.
3. On the last date of hearing i.e. on 23.05.2025, R-1, DGHS sought time to file reply and final opportunity was given to R-1 to file its reply.
4. R-1, DGHS is directed to file its reply on or before the next date of hearing with an advance copy to the Appellant.
5. Interim protection given on the last date of hearing is vacated.
6. Adj. to 07.10.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 05 of 2025

Bharat Singh & Ors. Vs. DM/RA, East Delhi

10.09.2025

Present : Shri Bharat Singh, Petitioner in person.
: Shri Ravi Trehan, Tehsildar for Respondent.

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. 65 of 2025

10.09.2025

Present : Shri Vinayak Bhandari, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Parveen Kumar, Counsel for R-1.
: Shri Mehul Singh Tomar, Counsel for LRs of R-3.

1. Partly heard the arguments.
2. Counsel for LRs of R-3 sought a list of following documents from the petitioner i.e.
 - i. Copy of Tehsildar Order.
 - ii. Copy of DM Order dt. 23.01.2025.
 - iii. Copy of Mutation Order in favour of R-1 & R-2.
 - iv. Copy of Compromise deed.
 - v. Copy of SDM order of year 2022.
3. Petitioner undertook to supply the documents to the respondents in support of their maintainability aspect alongwith a copy of the petition. Proof of service to be submitted in this Court before the next date of hearing.
4. Reply of R-5, SDM/RA is already on record.
5. It is seen from the records that the said village 'Kaira' stands covered under LDRA Notification dated 18.06.2013 as well as urbanization Notification dated 20.11.2019 whereafter the revenue authorities ceased to have jurisdiction in view of the various judgments of the Hon'ble High Court as well as the judgement dated 14th 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***".
6. Adj. to 08.10.2025 for arguments on maintainability.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 87 of 2025

**Om Prakash S/o Late Mhuktyuar Singh
Vs
Tehsildar, Najafgarh, New Delhi**

10.09.2025

Present : Shri Om Prakash, Petitioner in person.
: None for Respondent.

1. Heard the Petitioner.
2. The present revision petition has been filed under Section 42 of the East Punjab Holding (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation Act, 1948). Petitioner contended that the consolidation of the village Kair was done in the year 1952-53. As per consolidation record, his Khata is deficient and the same may be compensated to him. As per report submitted by the Halka Patwari concerned, the consolidation proceedings were completed in the year 1952-53 and consigned to Record Room and now, the Consolidation Oficer/Tehsildar becomes functus-officio.
3. It is seen from the records that the said village 'Kair' stands covered under LDRA Notification dated 18.06.2013 whereafter the revenue authorities ceased to have jurisdiction in view of the various judgments of the Hon'ble High Court as well as the judgement dated 14th 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***".
4. Accordingly, the Revision Petition bearing No. 87/2025 titled Om Prakash S/o Late Mhuktyuar Singh Vs Tehsildar, Najafgarh, New Delhi is remanded back to the DC/DM concerned with a direction to hear the parties and pass a speaking order, within next 60 days after considering the aforesaid facts.
5. The case is disposed of in terms of above.
6. File be consigned to record room after completion.

**(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 122 of 2025

10.09.2025

Present : Shri Vikas Pakhiddey, Counsel for Petitioner.
: None for Respondents.

1. Respondents are absent.
2. Issue dasti notice to the Respondents along with copy of the petition through Petitioner. Thereafter, Respondents to file reply within a period of ten days with copy to the Petitioner.
3. The matter is now fixed for arguments on the next date of hearing.
4. Adj. to 09.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 123 of 2025

10.09.2025

Present : Shri Anshuman Gupta, Counsel for Appellant.
: Shri Mukesh Kumar, Counsel for Respondent,
DGHS.

1. Petitioner contended that the Dr. Raja Nursing Home is currently operational and seeks time to respond on the present status of deficiencies so noticed.
2. Respondent contended that he has not received the copy of Petition.
3. Petitioner is directed to supply the copy of Petition to the Respondent, DGHS within next three days and file the proof of receipt to this Court failing which, cost may be imposed upon the Petitioner on the next date of hearing.
4. Respondent is also directed to file reply with an advance copy to the Petitioner before the next date of hearing.
5. Adj. to 07.10.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 165 of 2025

10.09.2025

Present : Shri Atha Sagar Verma, Counsel for Petitioner.
: None for Respondent.

1. Petitioner is directed to come prepared to argue the matter on the issue of maintainability as the village 'Ladha Sarai' was urbanised way back in 23.05.1963, on the next date of hearing.
2. Issue notice to the C.O. through the concerned District Magistrate to be present on the next date of hearing for arguments.
3. Adj. to 01.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 168 & 169 of 2025

10.09.2025

Present : Ms. Rachna Dalal, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.
: None for Respondent.

1. Proxy Counsel for Petitioner filed proof of service of notice served upon Respondents.
2. Petitioner is represented by proxy counsel. Petitioner is directed to appear with main counsel for arguments on the next date of hearing failing which the interim orders will be vacated.
3. R-1 and R-2 are directed to file reply within a period of ten days with copy of the same to the Petitioner.
4. Adj. to 01.10.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 189 of 2016

10.09.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.
: None for Respondents.

1. Heard the Petitioner.
2. Petitioner is directed to file amended memo of parties impleading the DDA as Respondent, thereafter dasti notice be issued to DDA through Vice-Chairman, DDA alongwith a copy of petition.
3. Issue notice to the Respondents through the DM concerned.
4. Adj. to 08.10.2025 for arguments on the issue of maintainability.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 288 of 2024
Hygiea Hospital
Vs.
Directorate General of Health Services, GNCTD

10.09.2025

Present : Shri Anuj Chaturvedi, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Shivam Sharma, Proxy Counsel alongwith Shri Rohit Tripathi, Pharmacist Officer for Respondent, DGHS.

1. Heard the arguments.
2. Vide the instant Appeal under Section 8(3) of the Delhi Nursing Homes Registration Act, 1953 (hereinafter 'the Act, 1953') the Appellant has challenged the Cancellation Order dt. 14.08.2024 passed by the Link Officer, Director General, Health Services, Directorate General Health Services, (Nursing Cell), Govt. of NCT of Delhi, whereby the registration of Appellant was cancelled by the Respondent.
3. Petitioner filed written submissions alongwith checklist of deficiencies noted and the actual state of affairs, taken on record. The petitioner contended that the impugned order is based upon facts as allegedly were in January/February, 2023 and, thus, ignore the actual state of affairs and circumstances prevailing on the ground at the premises of the Appellant. When cancellation was done on 14.08.2024 by DGHS.
4. The Respondent contended that the cancellation of registration was justified well within the framework of law and necessary to prevent risk to public health and safety.

5. Now, the present case being a matter of public welfare and considering the mitigating circumstances, petitioner is directed to approach the DGHS within one weeks alongwith the complete checklist of DGHS required to register a Nursing Home. In the meanwhile, no coercive action be taken qua the petitioner till a final decision based on updated checklist of Petitioner.
6. The Respondent, DGHS is directed to hear the petitioner based on the facts and circumstances of the case and pass a speaking order accordingly within one month from the date of filing of the representation by the petitioner. The DGHS would be free to impose any appropriate penalty, as per law for delay in compliance of the required norms.
7. This appeal is allowed to this extent and the case bearing no. 288 of 2024 titled ***Hygiea Hospital vs. Directorate General of Health Services, GNCTD*** is disposed of.
8. File be consigned to record room after completion.

(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No. 327 of 2018

10.09.2025

Present : Shri Raghvendra Pratap, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.
: None for Respondent, C.O.

1. None appeared for the Respondent, C.O. despite the notice. Issue notice to the C.O. through DM to appear and lead the arguments on maintainability failing which, a cost may be imposed on the C.O.
2. Adj. to 08.10.2025 for arguments on maintainability.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**