

Case No. 207 of 2025

03.12.2025

Present : Shri Shivam Sharma, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Ashish Soni, Patwari for Respondent, C.O.
Kapashera.

1. The Counsel for Petitioner contended that consolidation proceedings were initiated in the year 2019 and completed in 2021. During consolidation proceedings 8 biswa land from Petitioner's original holding were deducted. Counsel for Petitioner further contended that 4 biswa land was deducted during consolidation proceedings in the year 2015.
2. On query by this Court that if the consolidation proceedings initiated in 2019 how the land can be deducted in the year 2015. The Counsel for Petitioner sought time to satisfy this Court on the above issue.
3. Representative for Respondent, C.O. appeared and filed reply which is taken on record and copy of the same is supplied to the Petitioner. Counsel for Petitioner undertook to file rejoinder.
4. Since Petitioner is unable to bring out clearly the facts of the case, he is directed to come prepared on the next date of hearing failing which the matter may be dismissed.
5. Respondent, C.O. is also directed to present their case either through a Counsel or personally on the next date of hearing.
6. Adj. to 10.12.2025.



**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

**Gindori Devi
Vs.
Consolidation Officer/Tehsildar**

03.12.2025

Present : None for Petitioner.
: Shri Ashish Soni, Patwari for Respondent, C.O.

1. It is seen from the records that the said village Paprawat stands urbanized after Notification under Section 507 of Delhi Municipal Act on 16.05.2017 and Revenue Authorities cease to have jurisdiction after urbanization in terms of the Hon'ble Supreme Court Judgment dated 14.03.2023 in case titled **"Mohinder Singh (Dead) through LRs and Another Vs. Narain Singh and Others"**.
2. None appeared for the Petitioner today despite case being called twice. Today, final opportunity was given to the Petitioner to appear and lead the case.
3. It is also noted that none appeared for Petitioner on the last date of hearing also i.e. 26.11.2025 and a cost of Rs. 2000/- was imposed upon her and which was to be deposited today. No proof submitted for same.
4. It seems that the Petitioner is not keen to pursue the matter. Accordingly, the revision petition bearing No.362/2024 titled **"Gindori Devi Vs. Consolidation Officer/Tehsildar"** is dismissed for non-pursuance.
5. File be consigned to record room after completion.



(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi

**M/s. Accomplish Developers Pvt. Ltd.
Vs.
Additional District Magistrate (North) & Ors.**

03.12.2025

Present : Shri Vinod Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Appellant.
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-1, ADM (North)
: Shri Rishabh Chaudhary, Counsel for R-2 to R-4.

1. Proxy Counsel for Appellant filed list of dates and events and submitted that the present Second Appeal has been filed under Section 66 of DLR Act against the order dated 26.07.2021 passed by ADM (North), who has remanded the case back to SDM/RA for deciding the mutation afresh. He also contended that the First Appeal was filed by Respondent no.2 to 4 herein before the ADM (North) challenging the order dated 05.01.1990 in case bearing no. M-718/89-90 titled "Ram Singh Vs. Chottu" sanctioning mutation of land bearing Khasra nos. 13/13 (3-9), 13/16 (4-16), 13/24 (3-0), 13/25 (4-16), 14/21 (4-16), 26/3 (2-9), 26/4 (4-16), 26/5 (4-16), 26/6 (4-16) and 26/7 (4-16) total measuring 42 Bigha & 10 Biswas in village Kuluk Pur, Delhi. He further contended that the appellant had purchased the suit land during the pendency of the proceedings before the ADM and challenged the maintainability of the First Appeal as he was not impleaded as party before the ADM and no notice was served upon the appellant. He further informed that the matter has been remanded back to SDM which is still pending.
2. Counsel for R-2 to R-4 filed family tree of Bhola Singh, the original owner, alongwith chart of transfer of disputed property, as directed on the last date of hearing.
3. Counsel for R-1, ADM (North) stated that Respondent no.2 to 4 had not placed the 'Will' dated 23.01.1986 before the trial court/SDM/RA. The validity of the 'Will' and related evidence must be examined by the trial court before any final mutation order is passed. Hence, the matter was remanded to SDM/RA (Alipur) by the ADM and the same is still pending.

4. As the matter is pending before the SDM/RA, the case is accordingly remanded back to the SDM/RA (Alipur) to pass a speaking and reasoned order in the pending proceedings preferably within next three months, after giving opportunity of hearing to all concerned parties including the appellant herein.
5. The revision petition bearing no. 125/2025 is disposed of in terms of the above.
6. File be consigned to record room after completion.



(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi

03.12.2025

Present : Shri N. S. Dalal, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Shyam Sundar, Counsel for Respondents.

1. Counsel for Petitioners contended that they have preferred this revision petition by challenging the impugned order dated 26.08.2025 passed by the Revenue Assistant as it ignores binding orders of the Additional Collector (1996), Financial Commissioner (1997 & 2012), and the Hon'ble High Court (2004). The land measuring 617 bighas 3 biswas belongs jointly to five co-sharers, each having a 1/5th share. No lawful partition by metes and bounds has ever taken place in terms of suit filed under Section 55 of the DLR Act in the year 1986. Earlier findings of alleged partition based on Khatoni entries of 1985-86 were already rejected by all superior authorities, and those decisions have attained finality. The Revenue Assistant wrongly relied on consolidation notings, even though no application for partition was ever filed before Consolidation Authorities and no repartition under law ever occurred. The predecessor Financial Commissioner's order dated 03.08.2023 narrated a denovo partition and examination of consolidation proceedings only if just and fair. These mandatory directions were not followed while passing the present impugned orders on 26.08.2025, violating natural justice. The impugned order is contrary to binding precedents, ignores evidence on record, and is illegal and unsustainable, accordingly, it deserves to be set aside.
2. Counsel for Petitioner further contended that he has prayed:
 - i. To Set aside the order dated 26.08.2025.
 - ii. Give 2/5 share of the land to Petitioners, as per law. Award costs to Petitioners. Give any other relief the Court finds fair.
3. Counsel for R-1 & R-2 filed reply which is taken on record. He contended that the Revenue Assistant rightly dismissed the partition suit under Section 55 of the DLR Act, 1954, as the parties' holdings had separated via a 1976 family settlement, recorded in revenue records, and repartitioned in 1997-2004 as per consolidation proceedings. All parties

trace title to Sh. Raghubir Singh; Smt. Dil Kaur held no co-sharer status. Under the Delhi Land Holdings Ceiling Act, 1960, a 03.09.1976 settlement allotted petitioners specific khasras (163 Bigha 9 Biswa) exclusively, consented by respondents, confirmed by an affidavit dated 03.09.1976. This constituted "transfer" as per Explanation to Section 22 DLR Act, 1954 (family settlement/Section 40 exchange), mutated as "partition" in O-4 Register and separate 1985-86 Khatauni. Petitioners' 1985 suit cited outdated 1980-81 Khatauni, hiding 1985-86 separation and their 1976 exclusive possession application as well as affidavit. Section 55 of the Delhi Land Reforms (DLR) Act 1954 permits suits but not exclusively and family settlements are also valid mode of partition as held by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in case titled "Rajender Mohan Rana Vs. Prem Prakash" in Case No. 554/2011.

4. None appeared for R-3, SDM. Issue notice to the R-3, SDM through DM concerned to appear and file reply.
5. Respondent, R-1 & R-2 are directed to file a copy of the family settlement agreement with an advance copy to the Petitioners, whereafter the Petitioner may file rejoinder, taking the same into account.
6. Both the parties are directed to come prepared for arguments so that the matter can proceed further.
7. Adj. to 17.12.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**