

29.10.2025

Present : Shri Mohit Tyagi, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Aakash Tyagi, Proxy Counsel for R-1/Review
Applicant.

1. Counsel for Petitioner filed list of dates, chronology of events and also filed the judgment dated 04.03.2016 passed by the Supreme Court, taken on record.
2. Proxy Counsel for R-1 requested for adjournment.
3. This Court raised query to the Counsel for Respondents that Respondents had to produce order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India which became the basis for the Tehsildar's order.
4. The Counsel for Petitioner on the other hand, contended that there was no directions to Tehsildar in the order of the Hon'ble Apex Court and the Predecessor of this Court vide order dated 15.11.2018 had imposed cost of Rs.1.5 Lakh for mis-interpretation of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and the same has not been deposited by the R-1/Review Applicant till date. In rebuttal, Respondent submitted that an application for waive of cost is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. However, he was unable to submit any document to confirm this.
5. It has been contended by the R-1/Review Applicant that the present review application has been filed against the order dated 04.08.2023 passed by this Hon'ble Court stating that due to declaration of village Burari as urbanized vide Notification dated 16.05.2017, hence the revenue authorities cease to have jurisdiction and the impugned order dated 11.01.2019 was declared as non-est.

6. Petitioner on the other hand submitted that this is the fifth round of litigation, which has been imposed upon him unnecessarily.
7. Final opportunity is given to the R-1/Review Applicant to argue the matter.
8. Adj. to 19.11.2025 for arguments

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 103 of 2025

Omprakash (deceased) through LR Kalawati (wife).
Vs.
Gaon Sabha Ladpur & Anr.'

29.10.2025

Present : Shri U.M. Tripathi, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Ajit Kumar Sharma, Counsel for Respondent,
Gram Sabha.
(BTF Filed)

1. This Court raised query as to why Petitioner has approached this Court after urbanisation of village Ladpur in the year 2017. Petitioner submitted that he has filed an appeal against the order dated 31.01.2011 passed by RA/SDM, Saraswati Vihar before Deputy Commissioner but the said appeal is still pending and he has approached this Court since this Court has revisionary power to hear the petition.
2. The case of the Petitioner is that in the year 1970, the deceased Omprakash was allotted land (Banjar Kadeem) admeasuring 4 bighas and 14 biswa under khata no. 49/5 (0-16, 6/1(1-5), 15/1 (2-13) in the revenue estate of village Ladpur, Delhi under 20 point programme of Union of India for period of 5 years. The said land was allotted to Omprakash on 07.04.1973 for the use and occupation which was re-allotted in the year 1976 for further 5 years. The said land was recorded in the name of Omprakash as asami being the khudkast of the land by the Halka Patwari.
3. In the year 1994 Petitioner filed petition under section 74(4) of Delhi Land Reforms act, 1954 for declaring him as Bhumidar of the land before the SDM/RA. During the pendency and Petitioner Shri Omprakash died in the year 2001 and his LR Smt. Kalawati (wife) was impleaded as party to represent the case on his behalf.
4. The Petitioner further submitted that the Petition was dismissed by RA/SDM vide order dated 31.01.2011 which was challenged by the Petitioner by filing appeal dated 25.02.2011 before Deputy Commissioner, (NW) and the

same is still pending even after passing of more than 14 years.

5. Petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 31.01.2011 pending proceedings before Deputy Commissioner (North) and seeks to quash/ set aside the impugned proceedings as the village Ladpur was declared as urbanised on 16.05.2017.
6. It has been held in a catena of judgement passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India as well as Hon'ble High Court of Delhi notably that once the area has been urbanised, the revenue authorities ceases to have jurisdiction.
7. Averting to the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948, the purpose of this Consolidation Act as mentioned in its preamble is "*An Act to provide for the compulsory consolidation of agricultural holdings and for preventing the fragmentation of agricultural holdings in the State of Punjab and for the assignment or reservation of land for common purpose of the village*". The entire outcome of the process of consolidation to achieve the purpose stated in the preamble of consolidation is to prepare a new record of rights in accordance with the Land Revenue Act as per Section 22 of the Consolidation Act.
8. The basic purpose of the Consolidation Act therefore is to prevent fragmentation of land and to render agricultural activity to remain viable. The mother document on which the entire consolidation is based on, is the 'record of rights'. The record of rights in the Consolidation Act is as defined in Sections 6 and 22 of the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948 and takes its definition from the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887. In the case of GNCTD, the same Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 has been extended to Delhi through the aegis of Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954.

9. As already explained in the foregoing, once the Delhi Land Reforms Act and the Delhi Land Revenue Act cease to exist, post notification under DMC Act, the consolidation proceedings, even if started before the said notification cannot continue. This is because 'record of rights' of land as legally defined and sanctified by the Delhi Land Reforms Act and the Delhi Land Revenue Act cannot continue after the notification and the said Revenue Acts cease to exist except for reference and record purposes. Therefore, once the applicability of Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 ceases as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the revenue laws and as a logical extension as explained elsewhere above, the consolidation law cannot continue to remain valid. The remedies will lie elsewhere.
10. In the light of all the foregoing, in the matter where the village already stood declared as urbanised in 2017 would involve entering into an area where the revenue courts have no jurisdiction to enter. Further in the present case, the consolidation proceedings were initiated much prior to date of notification declaring the village Ladpur, Delhi. Therefore, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India judgement in Mohinder Singh is applicable in the present case also.
11. In view of the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **CA No. 3828/2017 titled *Mohinder Singh (Dead) through LRs and Another Vs. Narain Singh (d) through LRs and Others*** all proceedings under the DLR Act, 1954, from the date of urbanisation, become non-est and lose their significance.
12. Keeping in view the fact that the said village 'Ladpur' has been urbanised in 2017 and the proceedings u/s 74(4) of DLR are still pending before the Deputy Commissioner (NW), since 2011, therefore the case is remanded back to the concerned Deputy Commissioner to take into consideration all the above issues and the fact of

urbanisation, and then pass a speaking and reasoned order, preferably within next three months.

13. The revision petition bearing no. 103/2025 titled '**Omprakash (deceased) through LR Kalawati (wife). Vs. Gaon Sabha Ladpur & Anr.**' is disposed of in terms of the above.
14. File be consigned to record room after completion.


(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No. 75 of 2025

29.10.2025

Present : Ms.Deep Mala Kumari, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri S.K. Verma, Patwari for Respondent.

1. The petitioner contended that he has filed a revision petition under Section 42 of the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948, seeking the quashing of the impugned order dated 06.06.2022 since the said order was passed subsequent to urbanization Notification on 20.11.2019. The petitioner further sought a direction from the Court to the respondent, for removal/expunge of Rojnamcha report No.158 dated 07.06.2022.
2. The Counsel for Petitioner further submitted that he has approached this court for setting aside the order dated 06.06.2022 passed by the Tehsildar (Narela) of setting aside the orders of inheritance of 1/24 share of Ram Chandri (Mother of the Petitioners) in the names of the Petitioners in respect of land bearing Khasra Nos.40//20 (2-8) situated in village Barwala, Delhi and also removal of report dated 07.06.2022 in Rojnamcha of impugned orders in the jamabandi of khewat Jamabandi No.81, Khatauni No.41.
3. The Counsel for Petitioner further added that the said village Barwala was declared urbanized vide Notification dated 20.11.2019 and subsequent Notification dated 25.09.2020 issued by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Govt. of India.
4. This court further raised query to the Petitioner as to why he has not filed the appeal before the Settlement Officer to which no satisfactory reply was given. The Counsel for Petitioner prayed that the impugned order dated 06.06.2022 be set aside and

pass orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper.

5. Averting to the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948, the purpose of this Consolidation Act as mentioned in its preamble is "*An Act to provide for the compulsory consolidation of agricultural holdings and for preventing the fragmentation of agricultural holdings in the State of Punjab and for the assignment or reservation of land for common purpose of the village*". The entire outcome of the process of consolidation to achieve the purpose stated in the preamble of Consolidation Act is to prepare a new record of rights in accordance with the Land Revenue Act as per Section 22 of the Consolidation Act.
6. The basic purpose of the Consolidation Act therefore is to prevent fragmentation of land and to render agricultural activity to remain viable. The mother document on which the entire consolidation is based on, is the 'record of rights'. The record of rights in the Consolidation Act is as defined in Sections 6 and 22 of the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948 and takes its definition from the Punjab Land Revenue Act. In the case of GNCTD, the same Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 has been extended to Delhi through the aegis of Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954.
7. As already explained in the foregoing, once the Delhi Land Reforms Act and the Delhi Land Revenue Act cease to exist, post notification under DMC Act, the consolidation proceedings, even if started before or after the said notification cannot continue. Since the 'record of rights' of land as legally defined and sanctified by the Delhi Land Reforms Act and the Delhi Land Revenue Act cannot continue after the notification and the said Revenue acts ceasing to exist except for reference and record purposes. Therefore, once the

applicability of Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 ceases as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the revenue laws and as a logical extension as explained elsewhere above, the consolidation law cannot continue to remain valid. The remedies will lie elsewhere.

8. In the light of all the foregoing, in the present matter where the village Barwala has already stood urbanised in 2017 would involve entering into an area where the revenue courts have no jurisdiction to enter.
9. Since the impugned order has been passed by the Consolidation Officer/Tehsildar, the matter is accordingly remanded back to the Settlement Officer (Coordination)/SDM concerned to take into consideration all the above issues, including the judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Court and then pass a speaking and reasoned order preferably within next three months.
10. The Revision Petition bearing no. 75/2025 titled ***Baldev Singh & Ors. Vs. Tehsildar (Narela)*** is disposed of in terms of above.
11. File be consigned to record room after completion.

(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner

29.10.2025

Present : Ms. Vatsala Chauhan Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Subhash Chand, Patwari for Respondent,
Tehsildar.

1. The Petitioner filed restoration application under section 151 of Code Civil Procedure, 1908 for restoring petition bearing no. 165/2024 to its original number which was dismissed for non-prosecution on 26.09.2024 by the predecessor of this Court.
2. Petitioner contended that the consolidation proceedings ended in year 1981-82 and the record was consigned in the same year. But vide order dated 06.03.1984 the Consolidation Officer wrongly and illegally deducted an area measuring 5 biswas from the Petitioner's land which Petitioner came to know in the year 2001 and thereafter Petitioner filed revision petition before this Court challenging the order dated 06.03.1984. Vide order dated 21.08.2015 of this Court dismissed the petition of the Petitioner stating that Petitioner failed to prove that order dated 06.03.1984 vide which excess allotment was withdrawn. Against the order dated 21.08.2015 the Petitioner preferred a writ petition before Hon'ble High Court wherein Consolidation Officer was directed to dispose of the case expeditiously but not action was taken till 2022. The Petitioner is having a chequered history of litigations of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.
3. Petitioner contended that till today even after 14 years have been lapsed the Respondent is not able to produce the copy of the alleged orders whereby the land was withdrawn allegedly. Petitioner further submitted that this Court can still hear the case even after urbanisation of village.

4. Respondent filed reply and copy of the same provided to the Petitioner. Respondent is not represented by Counsel and he could not answer to the query of the Court as he was not well prepared. Petitioner wishes to file rejoinder on the next date of hearing.
5. This Court raised query regarding the order dated 18.04.2024 passed by Consolidation Officer as to how the said order can be passed after the village Paprawat was urbanised in the year 16.05.2017 under Delhi Land Reforms act, 1954.
6. Adj. to 19.11.2025 for arguments on maintainability.


**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

29.10.2025

Present : Shri Jatin Sharma, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Vinod Kumar, Counsel for Respondents.

1. It has been contended by the Petitioner that the petitioner has filed a review application under order 47 read with Section 151 CPC against order dated 27.04.2017 and for allowing the restoration application for restoration of revision petition to its original No.05/2016.
2. The Counsel for Respondents submitted R-1 Kuldeep Singh filed an appeal under Section 21(4) of the East Punjab Holding (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948 before the Deputy Commissioner (North-West). Aggrieved by the order dated 05.11.2015 passed by the DC (N-W), the Petitioner herein filed revision petition (bearing No.05/2016) under Section 42 of East Punjab Holdings Act, 1948. The predecessor of this court vide order dated 27.01.2017 dismissed the said petition for non-prosecution. Thereafter, the Petitioner herein filed restoration application (bearing No.33/2017) and the same was also dismissed for non-prosecution vide order dated 27.04.2017 passed by the predecessor of this court. Further aggrieved by the order dated 27.04.2017, the Petitioner filed restoration application (bearing No.86/2024) which was also dismissed for non-prosecution vide order dated 04.07.2024 passed by the predecessor of this court. Thereafter, the petitioner herein filed present review application of the order dated 04.07.2024 passed by this court.
3. The Counsel for Respondents also submitted that the Petitioner has not filed copy of the order dated 07.07.2022 which was a passed by the Deputy

Commissioner as mentioned by the Petitioner before this court.

4. On query raised by this court regarding non-presence of the Petitioner on 27.04.2017, the Counsel for Petitioner submitted that Shri Satbir Singh, husband of Rajwati, R-1 got ill and subsequently suffered from heart attack and paralytic attack and he remained under treatment for a long time and ultimately succumbed to the disease on 09.02.2022.
5. In the interest of justice, the present review petition is allowed and matter is accordingly restored to the Board subject to the cost of Rs.5,000/- to be deposited in the account of DDO, GAD, GNCTD before the next date of hearing.
6. Adj. to 19.11.2025 for arguments on merit

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

29.10.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Kumar, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Lokeshwar Sharma, Counsel for R-1, G.S.
: Shri Kunal, Patwari in person for R-2, SDM.

1. This Revision Petition has filed under Section 187 of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 (DLRA), challenging two orders: the final vesting order dated 19.12.2011 by the Revenue Assistant (RA) and the appellate dismissal order dated 11.09.2015 by the Deputy Commissioner (DC) seeking quashing/setting aside the order dated 21.12.2011 passed by the RA/SDM concerned and order dated 11.09.2015 passed by the Deputy Commissioner concerned in respect of the land comprising Khasra Nos. 8/22(4-16), 8/23(4-16), 27/2(4-16) and 27/3(4-16).
2. It has been contended by the Petitioner that the original proceedings before the RA were initiated under Section 81 of the DLR Act, in this case, by allegedly enclosing it with a boundary wall in Village Rani Khera. The petitioners, as recorded bhumidars (owners), sought to have both orders set aside on grounds of procedural irregularity and lack of basis, also the fact that the boundary wall has been erected after due approval of the SDM/RA.
3. The petitioners alleged that the proceedings under Section 81 of the DLRA were vitiated due to material irregularities and violation of the principles of natural justice, primarily the non-service of notice and absence of opportunity to be heard. Petitioner(s) further contended that there is no agricultural activity carried out at the suit property. Also the fact that they were never served the initial conditional order, the final order, or the show cause notice and also asserted that the DC, as the first Appellate Court, failed to adjudicate the fundamental issue of non-service of notice and improperly relied on fresh revenue staff reports without allowing the petitioners to rebut the evidence or lead their own.

4. The Counsel for Gram Sabha only stated that the petitioner has no locus to make this revision as the revision petition has been filed after a gap of 260 days i.e. beyond the period of limitation. Moreover, the vesting order has become absolute.
5. It is noted from the perusal of documents on record that the said village Rani Khera has been urbanized vide Notification under Section 507 of Delhi Municipal Corporation Act dated 16.05.2017 and the revenue authorities cease to have jurisdiction after urbanization in view of the judgement dated 10.04.2023 titled ***Rajeev Shah (Deceased) through LR Gayatri Shah Vs. Government of NCT of Delhi & Ors.*** passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and the judgment dated 14.03.2023 titled ***Mohinder Singh (Dead) through LRs and Another Vs. Narain Singh and Others*** passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.
6. Keeping the fact that the possession of the suit land lies still with the Petitioner, erection of a boundary wall is covered under the definition of "improvement under Section 3(12) of DLR Act and also that the said boundary wall was erected after due approval of the then SDM/RA.
7. The case is remanded back to the Deputy Commissioner (NW) with a direction to hear both the sides considering the facts mentioned above as well as the urbanized status of land and to pass a speaking order preferably within three months from today.
8. Accordingly, the Revision Petition bearing No. **171/2016 titled Jaipal Singh & Ors. Vs Gram Sabha Rani Khera & Ors.** is disposed of in terms of above.
9. File be consigned to record room after completion.

(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No.	Titled
57/2025	Kusum Goel Vs. Gaon Sabha, Ghevra
58/2025	Kusum Goel Vs. Gaon Sabha, Ghevra
59/2025	Kusum Goel Vs. Gaon Sabha, Ghevra

29.10.2025

Present : Shri Bhuvan Tomar, Counsel for Petitioner in all three cases.

: Shri Sumit Goyal, Counsel for Respondent, G.S. in all three cases.

1. Counsel for Petitioner(s) contended that they are the sole owner(s) of land measuring 01 Bigha and 03 Biswas in Khasra No. 89//2 Min. (1-03), Village Ghevra, Delhi, seeks quashing of proceedings under Section 65A of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954. The proceedings pending before the Deputy Commissioner (North-West) are challenged on the ground that the said village Ghevra has been urbanized vide notification dated 16.05.2017 under Section 507 of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957, thereby stripping the revenue authorities of jurisdiction.
2. Petitioner further contended that once a notification under Section 507 of the DMC Act is issued, the DLR Act cease to apply, pending proceedings become non-est. and has further prayed for quashing of the pending proceedings.
3. Counsel for Respondent, G.S. on the other hand submitted that the present revision filed is not maintainable, as the invoked provision of Section 187, DLR Act confers only revisional powers over concluded matters and cannot be invoked to interfere with pending proceedings under Section 65-A. Also, the petitioner's claim that revenue authorities cease to have jurisdiction after urbanization is self-destructive as they themselves have filed petitioner u/s 187, DLR Act. Moreover, the petitioner's claim of ownership based on a sale deed dated 14.09.2009 executed by the attorney holder Sh. Vinod Aggarwal is void ab initio, being in violation of Section 33, Chapter III-D, DLR Act, 1954 which prohibits transfer of land leaving the Bhumidhar with less than eight standard acres without approval of the Chief Commissioner. No such approval or exemption has been

shown, rendering both the sale deed and subsequent relinquishment deed invalid. In addition, the proceedings u/s 65-A, DLR Act is still underway before the appellate authority i.e. Deputy Commissioner (N-W) hence, the petition is premature.

4. From the documents on record, it is seen that the claim of the petitioner is based on sale deed as well as a relinquishment deed, for which mutation proceedings are pending before the SDM/RA and proceedings u/s 65-A, DLR Act is currently underway before the DC(N-W). Also, the fact that the said village Ghevra has been urbanized. It has been held in a catena of judgments including the judgments/orders of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi including that in WP(C) No.3502/2022 titled ***Rajeev Shah (Deceased) through LR Gayatri Shah Vs. Government of NCT of Delhi & Ors.*** and Hon'ble Supreme Court vide judgment dated 14.03.2023 in Civil Appeal No. 3828/2017 titled as "***Mohinder Singh (Dead) Through LRs. & Another Vs Narain Singh & Others***" that revenue authorities cease to have jurisdiction after urbanization.
5. Keeping in view the pending matter before the DC (N-W) in view, the cases are remanded back to the Deputy Commissioner (North-West) to hear both the sides and pass a speaking order preferably within three months from this order considering all the above facts.
6. Accordingly, the cases bearing nos. 57/2025, 58/2025 and 59/2025 are disposed of in terms of above.
7. Files be consigned to record room after completion.

(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner, Delhi

M/s. Sunrise Inframart Pvt. Ltd.
Vs.
Deputy Commissioner.

29.10.2025

Present : Shri Rahul Jariyal, Counsel for Petitioner.
: None for Respondent.

1. The present revision petition arises from proceedings pending before the Ld. Deputy Commissioner (North) arising out of the order dated 28.11.2017 passed by the Ld. RA/SDM (Alipur) under Section 81 of the DLR Act. The Revisionist is owner and in possession of land bearing Khasra No. 87/1 (4-16), Village Alipur, purchased through a registered sale deed dated 24.04.2014. Proceedings under Section 81 of the DLR Act were dropped by the Ld. RA/SDM (Alipur) vide order dated 28.11.2017, noting that the land is under agricultural use.
2. Petitioner further contended that the appeal filed by Gaon Sabha Alipur is pending before the Ld. Deputy Commissioner (N), who lacks jurisdiction as Village Alipur was urbanized vide notification dated 16.05.2017 under Section 507(a) of the DMC Act. Petitioner further contended that once a notification under Section 507 of the DMC Act is issued, the DLR Act cease to apply, pending proceedings become non-est. and has further prayed for quashing of the pending proceedings.
3. None appeared for Respondent to counter the arguments made by the Counsel for the Petitioner.
4. From the documents on record, it is seen that the claim of the petitioner is based on pending proceedings before the DC (N) is currently underway. Also, the fact that the said village Alipur has been urbanized. It has been held in a catena of judgments including the judgments/orders of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi including that in WP(C) No.3502/2022 titled ***Rajeev Shah (Deceased) through***

LR Gayatri Shah Vs. Government of NCT of Delhi & Ors. and Hon'ble Supreme Court vide judgment dated 14.03.2023 in Civil Appeal No. 3828/2017 titled as "***Mohinder Singh (Dead) Through LRs. & Another Vs Narain Singh & Others***" that revenue authorities cease to have jurisdiction after urbanization.

5. Keeping in view the pending matter before the DC (N) in view, the case is remanded back to the Deputy Commissioner (North) to hear both the sides and pass a speaking order preferably within three months from this order considering all the above facts.
6. Accordingly, the case bearing no. 61 of 2025 is disposed of in terms of above.
7. File be consigned to record room after completion.

(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner, Delhi

Case No. 97 of 2025

**Sudha Gupta
Vs.
Gaon Sabha (Bakoli)**

29.10.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Kumar, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Lokeshwar Sharma, Counsel for Respondent, G.S.

1. It has been contended by the Petitioner that the present revision arises Proceedings under Section 81 of the DLR Act, 1954 were initiated in Case No. 514/RA/ALP/2014 titled "G.S. Bakoli vs Smt. Sudha Gupta" alleging non-agricultural use of land measuring 1 Biswas in Khasra No. 60/2 (0-1), Village Bakoli, Delhi. The Revenue Assistant/SDM (Alipur) passed a restraint order on 18.11.2014 and a conditional order dated 23.07.2016 directing restoration to agricultural use. Based on the Patwari report dated 11.09.2020 confirming agricultural use, the proceedings were dropped vide order dated 14.09.2020. Gaon Sabha Bakoli filed Appeal before the Deputy Commissioner (North), Alipur, which is pending. The appeal is without jurisdiction as Village Bakoli stands urbanized vide LDRA Notification dated 18.06.2013, rendering DLR Act provisions inapplicable.
2. Petitioner further contended that the appeal filed by Gaon Sabha Bakoli is pending before the Ld. Deputy Commissioner, who lacks jurisdiction as Village Bakoli was covered under LDRA. Petitioner further contended that once a village covers under LDRA, the DLR Act cease to apply, pending proceedings become non-est. and has further prayed for quashing of the pending proceedings.
3. Counsel for Respondent, G.S. contended that the revision petition filed by the Petitioner is premature as the proceedings are still underway before the appellate authority i.e. Deputy Commissioner (N).

4. From the documents on record, it is seen that the claim of the petitioner is based on pending proceedings before the DC (N) is currently underway. Also, the fact that the said village Bakoli is covered under LDRA. It has been held in a catena of judgments including the orders/judgments of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi including that in WP(C) No.3502/2022 titled **Rajeev Shah (Deceased) through LR Gayatri Shah Vs. Government of NCT of Delhi & Ors.** and CS(OS) No. 78/2007 titled **M/s. Shri Neelpadmaya Consumer Products Pvt. Ltd. Vs Sh. Satyabir @ Satbir & Ors.**, that revenue authorities cease to have jurisdiction after LDRA.
5. Keeping in view the pending matter before the DC (N) in view, the case is remanded back to the Deputy Commissioner (North) to hear both the sides and pass a speaking order preferably within three months from this order considering all the above facts.
6. Accordingly, the case bearing no. 97 of 2025 is disposed of in terms of above.
7. File be consigned to record room after completion.

(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner, Delhi