

**Case Nos. 156 of 2025, 157 of 2025, 158 of 2025,
159 of 2025, 160 of 2025, 161 of 2025 & 162 of 2025**

22.09.2025

Present : Shri Bhuavan Tomar, Proxy Counsel for Petitioners
(in all cases).
: None for Respondents.

1. None appeared for Respondents.
2. Proxy Counsel stated that due to bereavement in relationship, the main Counsel could not appear before this court. Allowed.
3. The revision petition under Section 187 of DLR Act filed by Petitioner against the separate impugned notices under Section issued by RA/SDM on 11.03.2023 with regard to non-agriculture use of subject land in village Palla, Delhi.
4. It is noted that the Petitioner purchased the part of subject land through a registered sale deed dated 20.11.2022 from previous owner M/s.Vridhi Realtech Pvt. Ltd. and since the village Palla was notified under LDRA vide Notification dated 18.06.2013, the mutation of the said land was not recorded. It is further noted that two show cause notices dated 01.02.2023 & 10.02.2023 were issued to the Petitioner, but the Petitioner failed to appear before the RA/SDM. Thereafter, another notice dated 11.03.2023 was issued to the Petitioner by RA/SDM (Alipur). The Petitioner's grievance is that notices were issued to the previous owner i.e. M/s. Vridhi Realtech Pvt. Ltd. even though he had purchased the land.

5. Issue notice R-2, RA/SDM directly as well through Deputy Commissioner (North) to appear and defend the case on the next date of hearing.
6. Adj. to 29.09.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 115 of 2025

22.09.2025

Present : Shri Raj Kamal, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Neeraj Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Respondent,
Excise Department.

1. Petitioner appeared before this Court to seek appropriate direction to Excise Department, GNCTD to configure the Appellant's brand names on E-abkari Portal to enable the Appellant to apply for registration of its brands with Excise Department during the pendency of current appeal.
2. The Respondent, Excise department is represented by proxy counsel and main counsel is absent despite notice. The cost is not being imposed on the Excise Department since the case listing was advanced by a day from original schedule on request of Petitioner. The Excise Department is however directed to appear and lead the case on the next date of hearing. A notice be issued to Excise Commissioner to be properly represented on the next date of hearing.
3. Adj. to 30.09.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 88 of 2025

22.09.2025

Present : Shri D.V. Khatri, Counsel for Appellant.
: Shri Ajay Garg, Counsel for R-1.
: Shri Ujjawal Gupta, Counsel for R-2.

1. The Appellant contended that she is in possession and occupation of the property in question since before 1947 and she has filed the appeal No.12/2025 before this court under Section 30 of the Slum Area Act, 1956 against the eviction order dated 16.04.2024 passed by the Competent Authority (DUSIB). The Appellant contending the landlord tenant relationship, as ownership rights are not clear and C.A. has not considered the Appellant's submission in this regard.
2. The R-2 submitted that the Appellant has not paid him a cost of Rs.1,000/- imposed on the last date of hearing by this court to which Appellant agreed to pay the same today itself. On this promise, the court permits the proceedings to continue today.
3. R-1 submitted and raised the issue of limitation that there is a delay of approx. 240 days in filing the appeal by the Appellant before this court. Further, the application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act has not been heard before this court. Hence, the appeal filed by the Appellant is not maintainable.
4. Further, R-2 submitted that the Appeal under Section 20 filed by Appellant is not maintainable as per judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi dated 27.11.1970 in case titled Said-ud-din Vs. Mahabir Singh and Others held that "...10. Section 20 of the Act says that the decision of the appeal there under shall be final. This means that there is no appeal or revision possible of the said decision under the Act. The only remedy is the judicial

review under the Constitution within the limits of such review...". R-2 also relied upon the judgment dated 30.08.1979 titled "Usha Bhasin Vs. Competent Authority" and further submitted that only landlord can prefer an appeal before the Financial Commissioner and the Appellant herein can file appeal before the Hon'ble High Court under judicial review.

5. R-2 pointed out that as per paragraph (W) of the grounds of appeal filed by the Appellant, the Appellant has approached this court thereby filing this present appeal under Section 20 of the Act and not under Section 30 of the Act. However, Appellant accepted that there is typographical mistake which may be rectified and the appeal is under Section 30 only.
6. The Appellant requested for waiver of limitation period. In interest of justice, the delay is waived off.
7. The Appellant is directed to file amended appeal by rectifying the said mistake before this court before 10.10.2025.
8. Both the parties are directed to file their written submissions in brief alongwith citations, if any, in support of their averments latest by 10.10.2025. The matter fixed for final arguments on 27.10.2025.
9. Adj. to 27.10.2025 for final arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 178 of 2025

22.09.2025

Mentioned today by Shri Deepak Kumar, Counsel for Petitioner.

1. Counsel for Petitioner contended that he has filed an application dated 16.09.2025 under Section 151 of CPC whereby he has requested for grant stay and pass direction to the Respondent not to create any third-party rights and/or not to interfere in the actual physical possession of Petitioner with respect to the plot comprising Khasra No. 35/3 (0-4) situated within the extend Lal Dora of village Nangli Poona, Delhi.
2. Counsel for Petitioner further contended that a third party is encroaching the said land. However, he agreed that the potential encroachers have no relation with the judgement beneficiary flowing from the order of Consolidation Officer.
3. Under the situation mentioned in para 2, the request of Petitioner for granting stay is not maintainable here and is rejected.
4. However, these facts may be brought to the notice of the concerned DM and he may decide to take suitable action. Accordingly, the application dated 16.09.2025 filed by the Petitioner is dismissed.
5. The copy of this order be given dasti as requested by the Counsel for Petitioner.
6. The Revision Petition No. 178/2025 would however be taken up on 08.10.2025 already fixed in the matter.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**