

10.11.2025

Present : Ms. Anuj Yadav, Counsel for Appellant.
: Ms. Nancy Sharma, Proxy Counsel alongwith Shri Mohd. Asif, Son for R-1.

1. Heard both the sides.
2. Counsel for Petitioner contended that the the present appeal is filed under Section 30 of the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956 against the order dated 10.04.2024 and order dated 09.10.2024 passed by the Competent Authority, DUSIB as the impugned orders were passed without hearing or impleading the Appellant. Counsel for Appellant further contended that the R-1 received ex-parte permission from DUSIB in April, 2024 to evict certain tenants from the property at 10115/24, First Floor, Katra Tejab Mill, Library Road, Azad Market, Delhi. The Appellant was not served any notice and was not part of the DUSIB proceedings, even though he is in possession of the property and party to a related litigation in Civil Court regarding possession & declaration. R-1 herein later included the Appellant herein in a suit for possession, despite no permission for action against the Appellant. The Appellant's applications to set aside the ex-parte order and for a stay were dismissed without proper hearing by the Competent Authority.
3. Proxy Counsel for R-1 appeared and contended that Appellant herein has filed this application seeking condonation of a delay of 358 days in filing the appeal without showing any sufficient cause. The Appellant was aware of the proceedings under Section 19 of the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956, as early as August 2023, when R-1 filed documents in the Appellant's earlier civil suit. Despite having knowledge, the Appellant did not act in time and later pursued wrong remedies under the CPC, which cannot justify the delay.

R-1 further contended that the reasons stated in the application, including those about collection of documents and the absence of counsel, are vague, false, and unsupported by evidence. The Appellant has been litigating in various other matters during the same period, which shows that there was no genuine reason preventing timely filing before the Competent Authority as well as before this Court. Hence, the delay is deliberate and not bonafide. Therefore, the application for condonation of delay is frivolous, lacks sufficient cause, and deserves to be dismissed with costs.

4. The delay is condoned in interest of justice. Further, keeping in view the above contentions made by both the sides, both the parties are directed to file their brief written submissions/arguments latest by 24.11.2025 whereafter the orders shall be passed on the basis of the documents available on record.
5. Case is reserved for pronouncement of orders on 08.12.2025.



**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

10.11.2025

Present : Shri D.V. Khatri, Counsel for Appellant.
: Shri Deepak Singh, Proxy Counsel for R-1, DUSIB.
: Shri Ujjwal Gupta, Counsel for R-2.

1. The Counsel for Appellant contended that he has filed the appeal under Section 30 of the Slum Area (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956 against the impugned order dated 16.04.2024 passed by the Competent Authority and requested to set aside the said impugned order. The same is legally permissible to a tenant under Section 30 of the Act. The Counsel for Appellant further contended that the Appellant is in occupation of the property bearing Shop No.3372, Ground Floor situated at Singhara Chowk, Qutab Road, Sadar Bazar, Delhi. The Appellant is a widow of 80 years old and is in possession and occupation of that shop since prior to 1947. The Counsel for Appellant also contended that R-2 filed petition under Section 19 of the Slum Areas Act claiming ownership of the said property and alleging that the Appellant was a tenant paying a monthly rent before the Competent Authority. The Counsel for Appellant further contended that the father & mother of R-2 purportedly purchased an undivided 1/4th and 1/6th share out of the total property measuring 2280 sq.yds through sale deeds dated 05.09.1955 and 23.07.1970 respectively. Thereafter, father and mother of R-2 have already sold appx. 670 sq.yds and further they got vacated 800 sq.yds of the property from M/s.Vijay Laxmi Transport. R-2 has also failed to provide any rent receipt or rent agreement to substantiate the alleged landlord-tenant relationship. The Counsel for Appellant also contended that one Shri Bhupinder Singh has been alleged to be tenant, then how he is a tenant as claimed by R-2.
2. The Counsel for R-2 submitted that the cost imposed upon the Appellant on 22.09.2025 has not been deposited

till date and the amended appeal has also not been filed despite directions by this Court. In this regard, the Counsel for Petitioner paid a cost to the R-2 today itself in the Court.

3. On specific query by the Court, the Proxy Counsel for R-1, DUSIB failed to explain the reason of defence in support of impugned order dated 16.04.2024.
4. The reply of R-1 & R-2 are already placed on record.
5. All the three parties are directed to file their written submissions in brief alongwith citations, if any, in support of their averments latest by 24.11.2025, whereafter orders shall be passed on the basis of documents available on record.
6. The case is reserved for pronouncement of orders on 08.12.2025.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

10.11.2025

Mentioned today by Ms.Neeta Behl, SPA Holder for Petitioner.

1. Case is mentioned today.
2. The SPA Holder for Petitioner contended that on the judgment dated 08.07.2024 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi dated in WPC No.9141/2024 in case title Shri Parmod Bahl Vs. Registrar Cooperative Societies & Ors, wherein it was held that "...*Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner's representation has not been decided till date, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent No. 1 (Registrar Cooperative Society) to decide the petitioner's representation dated 14th November 2022 at page No. 102 of the paperbook by way of a speaking order in accordance with law within four weeks. It is clarified that this court has not commented on the merits of the controversy. The right and conditions of all the parties are left upon. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition alongwith pending applications is disposed of*". Thereafter, the Petitioner approached the office of the RCS. The Asstt. Registrar vide order dated 07.10.2024 observed that Sh. Parmod Bahl is not eligible for allotment of plot in Sarai Jullaina CHBS Ltd. Aggrieved by the impugned order dated 07.10.2024, the Petitioner has filed the present petition seeking stay of the impugned order.
3. The impugned order dated 07.10.2024 passed by the Assistant Registrar, office of the RCS was gone through. It is noted that an elaborate of detailed order has been passed, thereby rejecting the claim of the present Petitioner. Accordingly, the stay of the impugned order is not granted.
4. Issue Dasti notice to the Respondents to appear and lead the case on the next date of hearing.
5. List on 28.11.2025.