

**Case No. 10 of 2025**

28.08.2025

Present : Shri Anuj Dhir, Counsel for Appellant in both cases.  
: Shri Vikas Nagpal, Counsel alongwith for R-1 in person.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-2, RCS.

1. Heard the parties.
2. Reply of R-1 has already been filed. R-1 agreed that he has received the required information from the society and is left with no grievance. However, the same was received beyond the stipulated time. The Appellant is also not interested in pursuing the appeal but does not want to withdraw appeal.
3. R-2, RCS sought time to seek instructions on penalty levied by the Registrar from the department. Allowed.
4. Adj. to 12.09.2025 for response from the RCS. Appellant and R-2 to be present on the date to lead the arguments.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 36 of 2025**

**Shri Surinder Singh  
Vs.  
Assistant Registrar(Section-6/GH) & Ors.**

28.08.2025

Present : Shri Surender Singh, Petitioner in person.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-1, RCS.  
: Shri Punit Arora, Representative for R-3.

1. Heard the parties.
2. The Petitioner contended that one information has been received but second information sought is yet to be received.
3. Counsel for R-1 submitted that information available with the society has been supplied to the Petitioner. The further details sought by the Petitioner are not available with it.
4. Accordingly, the matter is remanded back to the RCS with the direction to hear the parties and pass a speaking order, after assessing whether the information sought by the Petitioner is required to be maintained by the society or if the information is otherwise available with the society.
5. Case bearing no. 36/2025 titled **Shri Surinder Singh Vs. Assistant Registrar(Section-6/GH) & Ors.** is accordingly disposed of.
6. File be consigned to record room after completion.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

## **Case No. 57, 58 and 59 of 2025**

28.08.2025

Present : Shri Bhuvan Tomar, Counsel for Petitioner in all three cases.

: Shri Sumit Goyal, Counsel for Respondent, G.S. in all three cases.

1. Both parties appeared today.
2. Petitioner contended that the village 'Ghevra' was urbanized on 16.05.2017 and hence in view of the rulings of the Hon'ble Apex Court dated 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2023 in case titled ***Mohinder Singh (Dead) through LRs and Another Vs. Narain Singh and Others*** and the proceedings before the Deputy Commissioner under Section 65A of the DLR Act before the Deputy Commissioner are not maintainable.
3. The respondent claimed that if the DLR Act has ceased to apply, how the revision petition has been filed by the Petitioner under Section 187 of the DLR Act.
4. Adj. to 29.10.2025 for arguments on maintainability of the case before this Court.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 91 of 2025**

28.08.2025

Present : Shri Sri Om, Counsel for Petitioner.  
          : Shri Parikshit Mahipal, Counsel for R-2, G.S.

1. Heard the parties.
2. The said village 'Mundela Kalan' stands covered by the LDRA notification dated 18.06.2013, hence the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 ceased to exist. The petitioner is not able to justify the maintainability of the case before this Court.
3. Both the parties are directed to file their written submissions in brief alongwith citations, if any, in support of their averments on maintainability latest by 15.09.2025, whereafter orders shall be passed on the aspect of maintainability of the revision petition.
4. Case is reserved for pronouncement of orders on 29.09.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 99 of 2025**

28.08.2025

Present : Shri Alok Kumar Rout, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: None for Respondents.

1. Counsel for Petitioner is directed to collect the Dasti Notice, already issued on 21.05.2025 and serve them alongwith appeal petition to the respondents. He is also directed to file proof of the same in the Court before the next date of hearing.
2. Respondents are absent today. Issue notices to the respondents to appear and defend their case on the next date of hearing.
3. Adj. to 15.09.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 104 of 2021**  
**Delhi Transport Corporation & Anr.**  
**Vs.**  
**Bhajanpura Coop. Urban (T/C) Society Ltd. & Anr.**

28.08.2025

Present : Shri S. Chatterjee, Counsel for Petitioners.  
: Shri Gaurav Sachdeva, AR for R-1, Society.

1. Heard the parties.
2. Counsel for Petitioner contended that the borrower, R-2, employee of DTC has already retired and the DTC was not having any money of the R-2, borrower (other than gratuity amount) when it received the attachment order dated 22.03.2021 of the Assistant Collector. Further, that the gratuity amount cannot be withheld for recovery.
3. R-1, Society contended that the principal debtor i.e. R-2 was an employee of DTC and availed a loan amounting to Rs. 5.00 Lakhs from the Society on 11.03.2015. The R-2 defaulted and failed to return the said loan and as such an Award dated 23.08.2019 was passed by the Arbitrator under Section 71 of the DCS Act, 2003 against him and sureties.
4. The case is remanded to the RCS with the direction to pass a speaking order on the amount to be recovered and the source of recovery. He may also decide whether the recovery can indeed be enforced from gratuity amount. The DTC will justify before the RCS that gratuity was indeed the only amount left with it on the date of receipt of the execution order, as contended above.
5. Accordingly, the case bearing no. 104/2021 titled **Delhi Transport Corporation & Anr. Vs. Bhajanpura Cooperative Urban Thrift & Credit Society & Anr.** is disposed of in terms of the above.
6. File be consigned to record room after completion.

**Financial Commissioner**  
**Delhi**

**Case No. 341 of 2024**

28.08.2025

Present : Shri Anuj Dhir, Counsel for Appellant in both cases.  
: Shri Vikas Nagpal, Counsel alongwith for R-1 in person.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-2, RCS.

1. Heard the parties.
2. Reply of R-1 has already been filed. R-1 agreed that he has received the required information from the society and is left with no grievance. However, the same was received beyond the stipulated time. The Appellant is also not interested in pursuing the appeal but does not want to withdraw appeal.
3. R-2, RCS sought time to seek instructions on penalty levied by the Registrar from the department. Allowed.
4. Adj. to 12.09.2025 for response from the RCS. Appellant and R-2 to be present on the date to lead the arguments.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

## **Case No. 364 of 2024**

28.08.2025

Present : Shri Om Pal, Counsel alongwith Petitioner in person.  
: Shri Anil Kumar, Counsel alongwith Shri Ravindra Krishnan, AR for R-1, Bank.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-2, RCS.

1. The petitioner contended that against a loan amount of Rs. 95,000/- disbursed to him, an amount of Rs. 2,20,000/- already stands recovered from him. Also, as agreed by R-1, an amount of Rs. 5,000/- is already there in share account of Bank. R-1, Bank however contended that the appeal is not maintainable in this Court lies and before DCT.
2. Counsel for Petitioner is directed to explain the case on the issue of maintainability and also directed to file copy of the payments already recovered from him by the Bank. R-1 will also submit terms and conditions that permit it to recover loan with such a high interest rate and also the penalty in addition thereon.
3. Counsel for R-2, RCS is directed to file response on the permissibility of high interest rate and penalty levied by the Bank.
4. Interim orders to continue till the next date of hearing.
5. Adj. to 26.09.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**