

Case No. 133 of 2024

Prashant Mudgal Vs. C.o./Tehsildar Alipur & Ors.

24.09.2025

Present : Shri Lakshay Suha, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Rajesh Sharma, Proxy Counsel for R-2 to R-5.

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. 259 of 2024
Vidya Sagar (Deceased) through LR's Vs. G.S. Burari & Ors.**

**Case No. 260 of 2024
Vidya Sagar (Deceased) through LR's Vs. G.S. Burari & Anr.**

24.09.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Sumit Goyal, Counsel for R-1, Gram Sabha.
: Shri Krishan Sharma, Proxy Counsel for Respondent DDA.

1. Vide separate common order, the cases are disposed of.
2. Files be consigned to record room after completion.

**(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 78 of 2025

Country Life Grapes Plantations (P) Ltd.
Vs.
Collector/D/C (New Delhi) & Anr.

24.09.2025

Present : Shri S.S.Rana, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Lokeshwar Sharma, Counsel for Respondent,
Gram Sabha.

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. 79 of 2025

**Village Life Farms (P) Ltd.
Vs.
Collector/D/C(New Delhi) & Anr.**

24.09.2025

Present : Shri S.S.Rana, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Lokeshwar Sharma, Counsel for Respondent,
Gram Sabha.

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. 153 of 2025

24.09.2025

Present : Shri Sriom, Counsel for Petitioners.
: None for Respondents.

1. The Petitioner contended that the Petitioner has filed revision petition under Section 72 of the DLR Act read with Section 42 of East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation & Prevention of Fragmentation) Act against the proceedings carried out by Respondents herein in respect of Kh.No.173/1 (3-18), 173/2 (0-2) total measuring 4 bigha 4 biswa at village Rawta , Delhi and requested to quash the demarcation proceedings and set aside all the orders passed by Respondents with regard to demolishing or constructing the wall etc.
2. No coercive action be taken in terms of the impugned order dated 01.03.2025 and demarcation proceedings qua the Petitioner till the next date of hearing.
3. Issue notice to the Respondents through this court.
4. Adj. to 01.10.2025 for arguments on maintainability.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 154 of 2025

24.09.2025

Present : Shri Mahesh Kumar, Petitioner in person.
: Shri Naresh Kumar, Counsel for Respondent.
(FILED VAKALATNAMA)

1. Petitioner appears in person and sought time to appear with his Counsel on the next date of hearing.
Allowed.
2. Counsel for Respondent also sought time contending that he has recently been engaged in the matter.
Allowed.
3. Adj. to 11.11.2025 for arguments on limitation and maintainability.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 155 of 2025

24.09.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Sumit Goyal, Counsel for Respondent, Gram Sabha.

1. Petitioner contended that copy of petition is supplied to the Respondent for filing reply before the next date of hearing with an advance copy to the Petitioner.
2. Respondent contended that present writ petition is not maintainable u/s 187 in this Court, first the matter will lie u/s 185 before DM.
3. Adj. to 12.11.2025 for arguments on the aspect of limitation and maintainability before this Court, Petitioner will also respond to observation of the Respondent.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 171 of 2025

24.09.2025

Present : Shri Vinay Kumar Pathak, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Sumit Goyal, Counsel for R-1, Gram Sabha.

1. Petitioner contended that a common passage in Village Fatehpur Beri, which is a LDRA village, is illegally occupied by R-3 herein and thereby obstructing the passage of the Petitioner.
2. R-1, R-2 and R-3 to file their reply before the next date of hearing.
3. Petitioner to clarify as to how does this Court has jurisdiction after LDRA notification dated 18.06.2013 on the next date of hearing.
4. Adj. to 12.11.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 82 of 2025

24.09.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Lokeshwar Sharma, Counsel for Respondent, Gram Sabha, Singhu.

5. The Petitioner contended that the village Singhu was notified as LDRA vide Notification dated 18.06.2013 and the said village also stands urbanized on 20.11.2019. The Petitioner also contended that proceedings are pending before the ADM since 2002 and no effective hearing was given since then.
6. On the other hand, Gram Sabha submitted that the revision petition is pre-mature as proceedings pending before ADM. Hence, it is non-maintainable before FC Court.
7. The Petitioner could not furnish any proof whether he raised the fact of LDRA and urbanization notifications before the ADM. He was also unable to explain why matter be not remanded back but insisted for one more opportunity.
6. Adj. to 01.10.2025 for further arguments on maintainability of the case before this court.

**Financial Commissioner,
Delhi**

Case No. 20 of 2025

24.09.2025

Present : Ms. Nishtha Sinha, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri S.S. Rana, Counsel for R-4.

1. None appeared for R-1, R-2 & R-3.
2. Proxy Counsel for Petitioner submitted that the arguing Counsel is not present today and wanted one more opportunity.
3. A cost of Rs.2,000/- is imposed on the Petitioner for not pursuing the matter diligently. The cost is to be payable to General Administration Department, GNCTD. The Petitioner is directed to submit the receipt of payment before this court on the next date of hearing.
4. R-4 submitted that the Petitioner herein has filed 2nd Appeal before the Deputy Commissioner/Assistant Director (Consolidation) against the order dated 11.09.2020 passed by Settlement Officer. The DC vide order dated 20.09.2023 dismissed the said appeal being devoid of merits. Thereafter, aggrieved by the order dated 20.09.2023, the Petitioner herein approached this court and filed revision petition under Section 42 of the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948. R-4 submitted that the revision petition is not maintainable because order passed by DC can be challenged in the Hon'ble High Court only by filing a writ petition.
5. Subject to payment of cost, one final opportunity is given to the Petitioners to be represented appropriately on the next date of hearing.
6. Adj. to 19.11.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 37 of 2025

24.09.2025

Present : Shri Prajwal Sharma, Proxy Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Sumit Goyal, Counsel for R-1, G.S.
: Shri Ashish Shukla, Patwari for R-2, SDM/RA.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 187 of DLR Act seeking quashing/setting aside the pending proceedings before the R-2, SDM/RA (Najafgarh) and notice dt. 07.01.2025 as null and void without jurisdiction as the said village Roshanpura was urbanized vide notification on 16.05.2017.
2. The Petitioner pleaded that the said village Roshanpura 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.
3. R-1 and R-2 did not have anything to counter this argument. Accordingly, the case is remanded back to the SDM/RA (Najafgarh) with the direction to hear the petitioner and pass a speaking order within three months after taking into account that the village was urbanized on 16.05.2017. He may keep in view the various orders of Apex Court and High Court in this context.
4. Petitioners are directed to appear before SDM/RA (Najafgarh) on 01.10.2025 to present their case.
5. The revision petition bearing no. 37/2025 titled ***Shri Ramesh Kumar Vs. SDM/RA (Najafgarh) & Ors.*** is disposed of in terms of above.
6. File be consigned to record room after completion.

**(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 83 of 2025
Shri Juglal(now deceased) through & Ors.
Vs.
SDM/RA (Vasant Vihar) & Ors

24.09.2025

Present : Shri Sri Om, Counsel for Petitioners.
: Shri Ashish Shukla, Patwari for R-1, SDM/RA.
: Shri Sumit Goyal, Proxy Counsel for R-2, G.S.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 187 of DLR Act seeking quashing/setting aside the pending proceedings before the SDM/RA (Vasant Vihar) under Section 86-A of DLR Act and to declare it non-est due to limitation. Also, the said village Rajokari was LDRA vide notification dt. 18.06.2013 and also urbanized vide notification on 20.11.2019.
2. It is seen from the records that the said village Rajokari stands covered by the urbanization notification dt. 20.11.2019 and covered under Low Density Residential Area (LDRA) vide notification dated 18.06.2013.
3. Accordingly, the case is remanded back to the SDM/RA concerned with the direction to hear the petitioner and pass a speaking order within three months after taking into account that village stands covered under LDRA notification and also urbanized.
4. Petitioners are directed to appear before SDM/RA concerned on 01.10.2025 to present their case.
5. The revision petition bearing no. 83/2025 titled ***Shri Om Prakash & Ors. Vs. SDM/RA (Vasant Vihar) & Ors.*** is disposed of in terms of above.
6. File be consigned to record room after completion.

(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No. 112 of 2025

**Shri Om Prakash & Ors.
Vs.
SDM/RA (Najafgarh) & Ors**

24.09.2025

Present : Shri Sri Om, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Ashish Shukla, Patwari for R-1, SDM/RA.
: Shri Sumit Goyal, Proxy Counsel for R-2, G.S.

1. Counsel for Petitioners filed the proof of service of notice.
2. The present petition has been filed under Section 187 of DLR Act seeking quashing/setting aside the Order dt. 27.06.2017 passed by R-1, SDM/RA (Najafgarh) and to quash the proceedings under Section 33 pending before the R-1, RA/SDM under DLR Act having passed subsequent to LDRA notification 18.06.2013. The said village Mitraun was also urbanized vide notification on 16.05.2017.
3. It is seen from the records that the said village Mitraun stands covered by the urbanization notification dt. 16.05.2017 and covered under Low Density Residential Area (LDRA) vide notification dated 18.06.2013.
4. Accordingly, the case is remanded back to the SDM/RA (Najafgarh) with the direction to hear the petitioner and pass a speaking order within three months keeping in view that village stands covered under LDRA notification and also urbanized.
5. Petitioner is directed to appear before SDM/RA (Najafgarh) on 01.10.2025.
6. The revision petition bearing no. 83/2025 titled **Shri Om Prakash & Ors. Vs. SDM/RA (Najafgarh) & Ors.** is disposed of in terms of above.
7. File be consigned to record room after completion.

**(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 172 of 2025

24.09.2025

Present : Shri Praveen Nagar, Proxy Counsel for Appellant.
 : Shri Sagar Chikara, Counsel for R-1.
 : Shri Ashish Shukla, Patwari for R-2, Tehsildar.

1. Proxy Counsel for Appellant supplied a copy of the appeal to the Respondents. R-1, R-2 and R-3 to file a reply before the next date of hearing.
2. Appellant is claiming that DC order dt. 17.05.2025 have no jurisdiction after the said Dhansa covered under LDRA notification dt. 18.06.2013 and should be declared non-est.
3. Appellant however not able to explain that in view of LDRA notification dt. 18.06.2013 why order dt. 03.04.2019 passed by Tehsildar be not set aside.
4. Adj. to 12.11.2025 for arguments on these issues.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 189 of 2025

24.09.2025

Mentioned today by Shri N.S. Dalal, Counsel for Petitioners.

1. The Petitioners filed revision petition under Section 187 of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 against the impugned order dated 26.08.2025 passed by RA/SDM.
2. The Petitioners contended that they are aggrieved by present proceedings initiated qua suit for partition filed by the Petitioners or their predecessor-in-interest thereby seeking partition of joint Khevat which belongs to the parties herein. He fears coercive action, if stay is not granted by this court.
3. No coercive action be taken in terms of the impugned order dated 26.08.2025 qua the Petitioner till the next date of hearing.
4. Issue notice to the Respondents through this court.
5. Adj. to 01.10.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**