

**Case No. 269 of 2023**  
**Jitender Kumar Tyagi**  
**Vs.**  
**Sudesh Tyagi through LRs & Anr.**

17.09.2025

Present : Shri Mohit Tyagi, Counsel for Petitioner.

: Shri Mradul Kumar, Proxy Counsel for LRs of R-1,  
Review Applicant.

1. Heard the parties.
2. It is seen from the records that on earlier occasion the Review Applicant/ Respondent submitted that the impugned order dated 11.01.2019 passed by the Tehsildar/C.O. is in compliance of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India order, hence it cannot be declared as non-est.
3. On 04.04.2025, the Review Applicant/ Respondent was given final opportunity to submit copy of Hon'ble Supreme Court of Delhi in Civil Appeal No.2522/2016 and establish the link between the orders of Tehsildar and orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court is established, the matter shall proceed further. But today also, the Petitioner failed to do so. The Proxy Counsel is also unable to submit copy of judgement or establish the link.
4. It seems that the Review Applicant/ Respondent is not interested to pursue the matter diligently as he again failed to established the link. Accordingly, the case titled as '**Jitender Kumar Tyagi Vs. Sudesh Tyagi through LRs & Anr.**' bearing case no.269/2023, is dismissed for non-serious pursuance.
5. File be consigned to record room after completion.

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

**Case No. 139 of 2025**

17.09.2025

Present : Shri Shaurya Katoch, Counsel for Appellants.  
: Shri Ayush Raj Jain, Representative of Respondent.  
(FILED VAKALATNAMA)

1. Representative of Respondent appeared, filed vakalatnama on behalf of his Counsel and sought time to appear with the Counsel on the next date of hearing.
2. Respondent is directed to file reply with an advance copy to the Appellants before the next date of hearing.
3. Adj. to 13.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 311 of 2024**

17.09.2025

Present : Shri Nagendra Yadav, Counsel for Appellant.  
: None for Respondents.

1. Counsel for Appellant appeared and contended that he had already filed the proof of service of notice on record. However, a copy of appeal alongwith notice not served although the Appellant was so directed on the last date of hearing.
2. Appellant is yet again directed to serve dasti notice along with copy of appeal on Respondents and file receipt of the same in Court before the next date of hearing. Further a cost of Rs.5,000/- is imposed on Appellant for not following the instructions.
3. Adj. to 13.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

**Case No. 349 of 2024**

17.09.2025

Present : Shri N.S. Dalal, Counsel for Petitioner.

: Shri Akshay Kaushik, Proxy Counsel for Order 1  
Rule 10, CPC, Applicant, Shri Mukesh Kumar  
Dahiya.

1. Petitioner was given opportunity to present the facts and his arguments on the case. He completed his arguments. However, certain facts could not be taken up in the arguments submitted by the Petitioner.
2. The impleadment applicant is represented by the Proxy Counsel today.
3. Hence, it would be in the interest of justice that the case be heard comprehensively on the next date of hearing.
4. Meanwhile, a fresh notice to issue to the Respondents through his DM, as well as directly, to be present on the next date of hearing to defend his interest. The Respondents shall also file a written response by 30.09.2025 with an advance copy to Petitioner.
5. Adj. to 15.10.2025 for further arguments.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**

<b>S.No</b>	<b>Case No.</b>	<b>Titled</b>
1	63/2025	Pradeep Kumar & Ors. Vs Gram Sabha Hiranki
2	64/2025	Devdutt through Attorney Vs Gram Sabha Hiranki

17.09.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Petitioners (in both cases).  
 : None for Respondent Gram Sabha, Hiranki (in both cases).

1. Heard the Counsel for Petitioners.
2. Counsel for Petitioners contended that the present review petitions have been filed under Section 114 and Order 47 of Civil Procedure Code, 1908 for review of the order dated 31.01.2025 passed by this Court.
3. Counsel for Petitioner further contended that he has challenged the appeal pending before the ADM (North), Delhi filed by the Gram Sabha. The said village Hiranki stands covered by the LDRA Notification dated 18.06.2013 and urbanised vide Notification 20.11.2019.
4. Reply of Respondent Gram Sabha is already on record.
5. The said village Hiranki stands covered under LDRA Notification dated 18.06.2013 and by the urbanization Notification dated 20.11.2019, and there are many judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and High Court of Delhi on jurisdiction of revenue Courts subsequently.
6. Accordingly, the cases are remanded back to the ADM concerned with the direction to hear the parties and pass a speaking order, keeping in view the judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Court, within a period of 60 days. Parties are directed to appear and represent their cases with facts and figures on 29.09.2025 before the ADM.

7. The review petition bearing no. 63/2025 titled ***Pradeep Kumar & Ors. Vs Gram Sabha Hiranki*** and review Petition bearing no. 64/2025 titled ***Devdutt through Attorney Vs Gram Sabha Hiranki*** are disposed of in terms of above.
8. Files be consigned to record room after completion.

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

**Case No. 107 of 2025**

**Shri Sunil Dutt Sharma  
Vs.  
Gaon Sabha (Asola)**

17.09.2025

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

1. Partly heard the Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.
2. Petitioner is directed to file proof of service of notice by today, only thereafter order may be issued.
3. The present petition has been filed under Section 187 of DLR Act seeking quashing/setting aside the order dated 28.06.2017 passed by the SDM/RA (Hauz Khas) under Section 81 of DLR Act and to declare it non-est having passed subsequent to LDRA notification 18.06.2013. The village was also urbanized vide notification on 20.11.2019.
4. Keeping in view that the said village Asola stands covered by the urbanization notification dt. 20.11.2019 and covered under Low Density Residential Area (LDRA) vide notification dated 18.06.2013. 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.
5. Accordingly, the case is remanded back to the SDM/RA (Hauz Khas) with the direction to hear the petitioner and pass a speaking order accordingly on the issue of maintainability as passed by SDM post LDRA.
6. Petitioner is directed to appear before SDM/RA (Hauz Khas) by 29.09.2025.

7. The revision petition bearing no. 107/2025 titled ***Shri Sunil Dutt Sharma vs. Gaon Sabha (Asola)*** is disposed of in terms of above.
8. File be consigned to record room after completion.

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

**Case No. 171 of 2016**

17.09.2025

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

1. Partly heard the Petitioner.
2. None appeared for R-2, DM (North-West) and R-3, SDM (Saraswati Vihar) despite notice. Issue notices again to R-2, DM and R-3, SDM from this Court as well as through Divisional Commissioner concerned to appear adequately and lead the case and explain as to why a cost of Rs. 1000/- each be not imposed on them, on the next date of hearing.
3. None appeared for the R-1, G.S. Issue notice to G.S. to appear and lead the case on the next date of hearing failing which, cost may be imposed.
4. Adj. to 29.10.2025.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**