

## **Case No. 86 of 2025**

12.09.2025

Present : Mr. Swadesh Kumar, Counsel for Appellants.  
: Mr. M.S.I. Israily, Counsel for R-1.

1. Heard the parties.
2. The Counsel for Appellants contended that the impugned order had been passed on the basis of probity of the circumstances and is liable to be set aside.
3. The Counsel for Respondents submitted that the landlord tenant relationship had been clearly established by the Competent Authority. The Appellants herein is a man of means and had admittedly replied before the Competent Authority that he owns a residential space in Delhi. The Appellant has adequate income and has 3 children studying in private school. He has not been able to dispute any point before the C.A.
4. Both the parties are directed to file their written submissions in brief, alongwith citations, if any in support of their averments latest by 23.09.2025, whereafter orders shall be passed on the basis of documents available on record.
5. The case is reserved for pronouncement of orders on 07.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

## **Case No. 67 of 2025**

12.09.2025

Present : Mr. Akshay Bhardwaj, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Mr. Baleshwar Thakur, Accountant/A.R. for R-1, Society.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel alongwith Mr. Shahid, Sr. Assistant, for R-6, RCS.

1. The Counsel for the Petitioner contended that the Petitioner is the surety of late Narender Singh and challenged the recovery certificate as the same was issued against a deceased person. The Petitioner further contended that the LR's of the Principal Debtor has not been impleaded either by RCS or society. He also stated that without attempting any recovery from LR's, the Petitioner, as Surety has paid Rs.3.92 lakhs as against the loan of Rs.3 lakhs.
2. R-1, Society filed its reply alongwith authority letter of Baleshwar Thakur, Accountant to represent the society in this court. The society to clarify the recovery made from insurance policy.
3. R-6, RCS is to furnish a copy of the norms of rate of interest imposed by RCS in the matter of Society/T&C Society, if any on the next date of hearing. RCS would also clarify how the insurance policy would operate in this case.
4. Interim orders not to enforce any further recovery from Petitioner to continue till the next date of hearing.
5. As requested by the Counsel for Petitioner, the copy of this order be given dasti.
6. Adj. to 06.11.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 164 of 2024**

12.09.2025

Present : None for Petitioners.

: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel alongwith Mr.Shahid, Sr.  
Assistant for R-1.

1. None appeared for Petitioners.
2. A cost of Rs.3,000/- is imposed on the Petitioners for not pursuing the matter diligently. The cost is to be payable to R-1, RCS. The Petitioners are directed to submit the receipt of payment before this court on the next date of hearing.
3. Subject to payment of cost, one final opportunity is given to the Petitioners to be represented appropriately on the next date of hearing.
4. Adj. to 10.10.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 341 of 2024**

12.09.2025

Present : Shri Anuj Dhir, Counsel for Appellant.  
: Shri Gagan Marwah, R-1 in person.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-2, RCS.

1. The Counsel for Appellant assailed the impugned orders dated 10.06.2024 and 04.11.2024 and contended that the Appellant has now supplied the requisite information to R-1.
2. R-2, RCS filed an application under Section 151 CPC with prayers as regard to issuance of directions to the petitioner herein and R-2 to place on record the copy of the Managing Committee meeting wherein it was resolved to enter into a settlement with Shri Gagan Marwah and where the terms & conditions of the Settlement between the society and Shri Gagan Marwah were decided and further Smt. Rama Khandelwal, Secretary of Society as authorized to sign and execute the Memorandum of settlement and to explain as to what is the relevance of the Memorandum of Settlement dated 28.06.2025 in the present revision petition.
3. R-1 agreed that he has now received all relevant documents but they came much beyond stipulated time. He may clarify the dates.
4. R-2, RCS undertook to file a chronology of events in the present matter on the next date of hearing. She will also clarify the cost imposed by RCS after information stands furnished.
5. No further coercive action be taken in terms of the impugned order dated 09.08.2024 qua the Appellant till the next date of hearing.
6. Adj. to 06.11.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

## **Case No. 10 of 2025**

12.09.2025

Present : Shri Anuj Dhir, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Gagan Marwah, R-1 in person.  
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-2, RCS.

1. The Petitioner filed this revision petition under Section 112 of the DCS Act, 2003 seeking setting aside of the administrative order dated 09.08.2024 issued by Assistant Registrar wherein the Assistant Registrar has penalized the Petitioner with a penalty amount of Rs.7,000/- .
2. The Counsel for R-2 contended that the Appellant has supplied the requisite information to R-1 but supplied it well after due date and sought time to seek instructions on penalty levied by the RCS from the Department before the next date of hearing.
3. No further coercive action be taken in terms of the impugned order dated 09.08.2024 qua the Appellant till the next date of hearing.
4. As requested by the Counsel for Appellant, the copy of this order be given dasti.
5. Adj. to 06.11.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 84 of 2025**

12.09.2025

Present : Shri Astha Joshi, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Piyush Goyal, Proxy Counsel for R-1.  
: Shri Sandeep Kumar, Sr. Asstt. for R-2, RCS.

1. Counsel for Petitioner filed replication to the replies of Respondents and copies of the same are given to the Respondents.
2. Proxy Counsel for R-1 requested for adjournment as the main counsel is busy in the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. Allowed as a final opportunity to the R-1 to appear and lead the case adequately on the next date of hearing.
3. Representative of R-2, RCS filed reply with a copy to the Petitioner.
4. Interim orders to continue till the next date of hearing. However, on next date of hearing, the petitioner will make a clear case on why interim orders should be allowed to continue any further.
5. Adj. to 09.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 105 of 2025**

12.09.2025

Present : Shri Rajiv Vig, Counsel for Petitioner.

: Shahid, Sr. Asstt. for R-1, RCS.

: Shri Pradeep Dahiya, Counsel for impleadment applicant Major General Satish Chandra & Shri Sartejveer Singh Gill.

(Filed Vakalatnama)

1. Counsel for Impleadment Applicant filed an application under Order 1 Rule 10 r/w Section 151 of CPC on the ground that he was one of signatory among 101 members who approached RCS. The Petitioner was not able to make any case of any injustice caused to him by such impleadment. Allowed with the direction to appellant to file response to the Petition by 30.09.2025 with an advance copy to both parties before the next date of hearing.
2. Representative for R-1, RCS is directed to file reply latest by 30.09.2025 with an advance copy to the Petitioner and be regular during the court's proceedings.
3. Adj. to 09.10.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

Later on, Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-2 appeared and undertook to file reply with an advance copy to the Petitioner and requested to mark her attendance. Allowed.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

## Case No. 124 of 2025

12.09.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Devender Goyal, ASO for Respondent, G.S.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 187 of DLR Act seeking quashing/setting aside the order dated 24.12.2019 passed by the SDM/RA (Alipur) and quash the pending proceedings before the Deputy Commissioner/ Collector (North). Counsel for Petitioner contended that the said village Quadipur stands urbanized on 16.05.2017 and the present matter is a clear case of jurisdictional overreach.
2. Keeping in view that the said village Quadipur stands covered by the urbanization notification dt. 16.05.2017, thereafter the revenue authorities cease to have jurisdiction in wake of various judgments from the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. The landmark judgment 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"** directed:

*"36. After harmonizing the provisions of the Act, 1954 and Act 1957, we are of the considered view that once a notification has been published in exercise of power under Section 507(a) of the Act, 1957, the provisions of the Act, 1954 cease to apply. In sequel thereto, the proceedings pending under the Act, 1954 become non est and loses its legal significance."*

3. Accordingly, the case is remanded back to the DM with the direction to hear the petitioner and pass a speaking order accordingly within a period of 60 days, taking note of the fact that the said village stands urbanized. He will also pass a decision on the maintainability of the SDM/RA order of 24.12.2019 subsequent to urbanization.



4. The revision petition bearing no. 124/2025 titled ***Shri Mickey Sachdeva & Gaon Sabha (Quadipur) & Anr.*** is disposed of in terms of above.
5. File be consigned to record room after completion.

**(PRASHANT GOYAL)**  
**Financial Commissioner**  
**Delhi**

**Case No. 125 of 2025**

12.09.2025

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

1. Counsel for Appellant contended that the second appeal has been filed under Section 66 of Delhi Land Revenue Act against the order dated 26.07.2021 passed by ADM as the same being against the principles of natural justice. Despite being the actual owner (as purchaser) of the said property, the appellant was not even impleaded as a party in the first appeal before the ADM. He further challenged the maintainability of the first appeal before the ADM (North) and requested to call the Lower Court's Record.
2. None appeared for the R-1, ADM (North). Issue notice through concerned DM to appear and lead the case on the next date of hearing. It is apparently a dispute about ownership of property and hence ADM would clarify in what capacity the appeal has been handled by it.
3. Adj. to 08.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 211 of 2023**

12.09.2025

Present : Ms. Ritu Sakarwal and Ms. Aparna Sakarwal,  
Counsels for Petitioner.

: Shri Ravinder Krishnan, Bank official for R-1, Bank.

: Ms. Poornima Jain, Counsel for R-3, NDMC.

1. Counsel for Petitioner requested adjournment as he intends to settle the matter amicably and sought time for the same. Allowed as a final opportunity with the direction to approach the R-1 Bank within a period of one month and file the status of settlement, if any, on the next date of hearing. R-1, Bank to also comment on basis of interest rate fixation.
2. Adj. to 16.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

Later on, Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-2 appeared and requested to mark her attendance and noted the next date of hearing. Allowed. She will come prepared with norms on fixation of rate of interest by the lender.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 184 of 2025**

12.09.2025

Mentioned today by Shri Anuj Dhir, Counsel for Petitioner.

1. The Petitioner filed this revision petition under Section 112 of the DCS Act, 2003 seeking setting aside of the administrative order dated 04.06.2025 issued by Assistant Registrar wherein the Assistant Registrar has penalized the Petitioner with a penalty amount of Rs.5,000/- .
2. The Counsel for Petitioner contended that the Appellant has supplied the requisite information to R-2 and sought time to seek instructions on penalty levied by the RCS from the Department before the next date of hearing.
3. No coercive action be taken in terms of the impugned order dated 04.06.2025 qua the Appellant till the next date of hearing.
4. As requested by the Counsel for Appellant, the copy of this order be given dasti.
5. Adj. to 06.11.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 185 of 2024**

12.09.2025

Mentioned today by Shri Anuj Dhir, Counsel for Petitioner.

1. The Petitioner filed this revision petition under Section 112 of the DCS Act, 2003 seeking setting aside of the administrative order dated 04.06.2025 issued by Assistant Registrar wherein the Assistant Registrar has penalized the Petitioner with a penalty amount of Rs.7,500/- .
2. The Counsel for Petitioner contended that the Appellant has supplied the requisite information to R-2 and sought time to seek instructions on penalty levied by the RCS from the Department before the next date of hearing.
3. No coercive action be taken in terms of the impugned order dated 04.06.2025 qua the Appellant till the next date of hearing.
4. As requested by the Counsel for Appellant, the copy of this order be given dasti.
5. Adj. to 06.11.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 186 of 2025**

12.09.2025

Mentioned today by Shri Anuj Dhir, Counsel for Petitioner.

1. The Petitioner filed this revision petition under Section 112 of the DCS Act, 2003 seeking setting aside of the administrative order dated 05.06.2025 issued by Assistant Registrar wherein the Assistant Registrar has penalized the Petitioner with a penalty amount of Rs.10,000/- .
2. The Counsel for Petitioner contended that the Appellant has supplied the requisite information to R-2 and sought time to seek instructions on penalty levied by the RCS from the Department before the next date of hearing.
3. No coercive action be taken in terms of the impugned order dated 05.06.2025 qua the Appellant till the next date of hearing.
4. As requested by the Counsel for Appellant, the copy of this order be given dasti.
5. Adj. to 06.11.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

## **Case No. 23 of 2025**

12.09.2025

Mentioned today by Shri Sandeep Kumar, Counsel for Petitioner, Society.

1. The case was mentioned.
2. The Petitioner had filed revision petition bearing No.23/2025 and the same was dismissed for non-prosecution and on the basis of the submissions of R-2 herein, vide order dated 10.09.2025..
3. The Petitioner filed application under order IX Rule 9 read with Section 151 CPC for restoration of present revision petition bearing No.23/2025. The Counsel for Petitioner explained his inability to attend the court on the last date of hearing as he was before the Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in another case.
4. The Petitioner undertook to appear regularly in the court. Hence, the revision petition bearing No.23/2025 is restored to the Board with cost of Rs.500/- each to be payable to all Respondents.
5. Issue notices to Respondents through this court.
6. Adj. to 19.09.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**