

**Case No. 213 of 2025**  
**Bachan Singh**  
**vs.**  
**Consolidation Officer (Khera Kalan) & Anr.**

17.12.2025

Present : Shri Ashish Pandey, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: None for Respondent.

1. The Counsel for Petitioner contended that father of Petitioner Late Jai Singh is a recorded land holder in Village Khera Kalan, and his land as per old khata no. was 208/3 and under the consolidation proceedings, he has been allotted new khata no. 308/3. After his father's death, mutation was lawfully sanctioned in favour of the Petitioner and his brothers. With their joint consent, a separate khata was allotted to the Petitioner with Residential Plot (Rakba 2.02) and Industrial Plot (Rakba 0.6). Despite valid allotment, mutation, continuous residence, and repeated objections and appeals under Sections 21(2) and 21(3) of the Act, the Petitioner's name was never included in the demand list under the consolidation proceedings. Multiple hearings were conducted over the years, yet no reasoned or effective order was passed.
2. It has been further contended that after submission of consolidation records by the revenue department in the year 2025, the revenue authorities acknowledge that the Petitioner's land exists without demand allotment and is under re-examination. Counsel for Petitioner also contended that the Petitioner had obtained stay order from Hon'ble High Court of Delhi against the order of Consolidation Officer.
3. The Petitioner seeks insertion of his name in the demand list for Residential Plot Rakba 2.02 and Industrial Plot Rakba 0.6 of Village Khera Kalan, to which he claims to be legally entitled.
4. From the court records, it is observed that in the order dated 29.09.2022 the Consolidation Officer has stated that consolidation in village Khera Kalan has been completed

on 19.09.2022 and formal consent of Settlement Officer (Consolidation) is awaited for consignment of record. He also submitted the same statement in the affidavit dated 22.09.2022 filed by him before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in contempt case no. 918/2021. The Consolidation Officer vide order dated 07.07.2025 has only made clarification regarding entries in respect of all 204 khatas where deviation from the prescribed Rules/ Scheme of Consolidation was found and directions have been given to the halka patwari and kanungo to consign the consolidation record.

5. It is noted that the said village 'Khera Kalan' stands urbanised on 20.11.2019 and the revenue authorities cease to have jurisdictions after urbanisation in terms of judgement passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case no. CA No.3827/2017 dated 14.03.2023 in the matter of "***Mohinder Singh (Deceased) through LRs. & Ors. Vs. Narain Singh (Deceased) through LRs & Ors.***".
6. Further, post-urbanization, to enter in the matter where the village already stood urbanized in 2019 would involve entering into an area where the revenue courts have no jurisdiction to enter.
7. The Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 ceases to exist after urbanisation in accordance with the judgment dated 26.03.2010 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the case titled as ***Indu Khorana Vs. Gram Sabha***, the ruling of which was upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide decision dated 05.04.2016 and also as per recent judgement dated 14.03.2023 of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled ***Mohinder Singh (Dead) through LRs and Another Vs. Narain Singh and Others***, in which the Hon'ble Court has held that – "36. After harmonizing the provisions of the Act, 1954 and Act 1957, we are of the considered view that once a notification has been published in exercise of power under Section 507(a) of the Act, 1957, the provisions of the Act, 1954 cease to apply. In sequel thereto, the proceedings pending under the Act, 1954 become non est and loses its legal significance." Said rulings do not provide for continued

applicability of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 by the revenue courts.

8. After the urbanisation of the land/village i.e. Khera Kalan on 20.11.2019 in this case, the definition of the land which is derived from the Delhi Land Reforms Act is non-existent once the Land Reforms Act goes. The Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 defines 'land' under Section 3(13) which is as under :-

*(13) "land" except in sections 23 and 24, means land held or occupied for purpose connected with agriculture, horticulture or animal husbandry including pisciculture and poultry farming and includes—*

- (a) Buildings appurtenant thereto,
- (b) Village abadis,
- (c) Grovelands,
- (d) Lands for village pasture or land covered by water and used for growing singharas and other produce or land in the bed of a river and used for casual or occasional cultivation, but does not include—  
*land occupied by building in belts or areas adjacent to Delhi town, which the Chief commissioner may by a notification in the official Gazette declare as an acquisition thereto ;*

Further, section 3 sub-section 5 & 10 of the Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954 defines 'land' to be as referred under the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954. The extract is as below:

#### ***Section 3 Definitions-***

*.....  
(5) "revenue" means land revenue;*

*.....  
(10) words and expression agricultural year, Asami, Bhumidhar, cess, charitable purpose, estate, Gaon Sabha, holding, land, rent, village or any other expressions, not defined in this Act and used in the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954, shall have the meaning assigned to them in the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954.*

9. From the foregoing, it is clear that the entire Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954 takes the definition of 'land' from the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954. The said definition of 'land' not being available to the Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954 when the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 ceases to exist post urbanization, makes it clear that the Delhi Land Revenue Act cannot stand on its own legs for whatsoever reasons. In simple terms, post the Delhi Land Reforms Act, the Delhi Land Revenue Act clearly has no basis to continue since the

definition of 'land' itself is "non-est" once the Land Reforms Act goes.

10. After urbanization of the land/village, the area that is squarely covered by the provisions of Section 1(2) of the Delhi Land Reforms Act is as under :

1. *Short title, extent and commencement-*  
(1) *This Act may be called the Delhi Land reforms Act 1954.*
- (2) *It extends to the whole of the Union territory of Delhi, but shall not apply to*
  - (a) *[the area which are or may before the first day of November, 1956 be included in a Municipality or a Notified Area under the provisions of the Punjab Municipal Act, 1911, or a Cantonment under the provisions of the Cantonment Act, 1924,*
  - (b) *[areas] included in any estate owned by the Central Government or any local authority, and*
  - (c) *areas held and occupied for a public purpose or a work of public utility and declared as such by the Chief Commissioner or acquired under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, or any other enactment other than this Act, relating to acquisition of land for a public purpose.*

11. 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.

12. 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 covered in Section 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. Section 31 of the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 explains 'record of

rights'. In the case of GNCTD, the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 has been extended to Delhi under the aegis of Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954.

13. Similarly, as per Section 2(b) the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948 - (b) "Consolidation of Holdings" means the amalgamation and the redistribution of all or any of the lands in an estate or sub-division of an estate so as to reduce the number of plots in the holdings; Further, 'economic holding' and 'estate' have been defined vide Section 3(7) and 3(8) of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954.
14. Therefore, it is seen that once Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 cease and consequently, the Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954 cease to apply, the definition of 'estate', 'record of rights' and 'economic holding' are not available for the purpose of the consolidation proceedings under the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948.
15. In the light of all the foregoing, post-urbanization, to enter into the matter where the village already stood urbanized in 2019 would involve entering into an area where the revenue courts have no jurisdiction to enter to begin with, therefore, this court is not inclined to deal with this petition further. Accordingly, revision petition bearing No. 213/2025 titled ***Bachan Singh Vs. Consolidation Officer, Khera Kalan & Anr.*** is dismissed.
16. Further, seeing the peculiar circumstances of the case, it would not be fair to deprive the parties from seeking remedy as per law. Accordingly, protection is provided to all the parties for the next sixty days to enable them to approach the appropriate forum of law for redressal of their grievances, if any. During this period, no third party interest shall be created by any party in the impugned land.
17. File be consigned to record room after completion.

(PRASHANT GOYAL)  
Financial Commissioner  
Delhi

**Bachan Singh  
Vs.  
Consolidation Officer (Khera Kalan)**

17.12.2025

Present : Shri Ashish Pandey, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: None for Respondent.

1. The Counsel for Petitioner contended that the Petitioner is the recorded owner of land under old Khasra Nos. 208/1 and 208/3 (new Khata Nos. 306 and 308) in Village Khera Kalan, Delhi. The consolidation proceedings were commenced on 29.09.2022 and concluded on 07.07.2025. The records from 1954-55 and 1999 consolidation show the petitioner's name as Bachan Singh with caste "Kom Jaat Jat Rana Gramvaasi". The current Khatoni Pamaish wrongly lists the name as Bachchan Singh, omitting caste, changes house number from 243 to 2113 in Khata 306, excludes "west side" for Khasra 59/15 min (8 Biswas, allotted in 2023), and fails to transfer Khasra 105/6 (old 145/6, 2 Biswas) from Khata 306 to 308. Aggrieved by the wrong entries and wrong spellings of the name of land holder made in khata of the Petitioner, the petitioner filed objections under Section 21(2) on 29.07.2025 name correction and transfer, 29.08.2025, 05.09.2025 and 06.10.2025 before the Consolidation Officer. The counsel further submitted that no hearings were held, and applications remain pending despite follow-ups. The Consolidation Officer's inaction fails to exercise jurisdiction under the Act, warranting revision under Section 42 read with Section 43-A.
2. From the court records, it is observed that in the order dated 29.09.2022 the Consolidation Officer has stated that consolidation in village Khera Kalan has been completed on 19.09.2022 and formal consent of Settlement Officer (Consolidation) is awaited for consignment of record. He also submitted the same statement in the affidavit dated

22.09.2022 filed by him before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in contempt case no. 918/2021. The Consolidation Officer vide order dated 07.07.2025 has only made clarification regarding entries in respect of all 204 khatas where deviation from the prescribed Rules/ Scheme of Consolidation was found and directions have been given to the halka patwari and kanungo to consign the consolidation record.

3. It is noted that the said village 'Khera Kalan' stands urbanised on 20.11.2019 and the revenue authorities cease to have jurisdiction after urbanisation in terms of judgement passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case no. CA No.3827/2017 dated 14.03.2023 in the matter of "***Mohinder Singh (Deceased) through LRs. & Ors. Vs. Narain Singh (Deceased) through LRs & Ors.***".
4. Further, post-urbanization, to enter in the matter where the village already stood urbanized in 2019 would involve entering into an area where the revenue courts have no jurisdiction to enter.
5. The Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 ceases to exist after urbanisation in accordance with the judgment dated 26.03.2010 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the case titled as ***Indu Khorana Vs. Gram Sabha***, the ruling of which was upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide decision dated 05.04.2016 and also as per recent judgement dated 14.03.2023 of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled ***Mohinder Singh (Dead) through LRs and Another Vs. Narain Singh and Others***, in which the Hon'ble Court has held that – "36. After harmonizing the provisions of the Act, 1954 and Act 1957, we are of the considered view that once a notification has been published in exercise of power under Section 507(a) of the Act, 1957, the provisions of the Act, 1954 cease to apply. In sequel thereto, the proceedings pending under the Act, 1954 become non est and loses its legal significance." Said rulings do not provide for continued applicability of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 by the revenue courts.

6. After the urbanisation of the land/village i.e. Khera Kalan on 20.11.2019 in this case, the definition of the land which is derived from the Delhi Land Reforms Act is non-existent once the Land Reforms Act goes. The Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 defines 'land' under Section 3(13) which is as under :-

*(13) "land" except in sections 23 and 24, means land held or occupied for purpose connected with agriculture, horticulture or animal husbandry including pisciculture and poultry farming and includes—*

- (a) Buildings appurtenant thereto.*
- (b) Village abadis,*
- (c) Grovelands,*
- (d) Lands for village pasture or land covered by water and used for growing singharas and other produce or land in the bed of a river and used for casual or occasional cultivation, but does not include—  
land occupied by building in belts or areas adjacent to Delhi town, which the Chief commissioner may by a notification in the official Gazette declare as an acquisition thereto :*

Further, section 3 sub-section 5 & 10 of the Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954 defines 'land' to be as referred under the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954. The extract is as below:

### ***Section 3 Definitions-***

.....

*(5) "revenue" means land revenue;*

.....

*(10) words and expression agricultural year, Asami, Bhumidar, cess, charitable purpose, estate, Gaon Sabha, holding, land, rent, village or any other expressions, not defined in this Act and used in the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954, shall have the meaning assigned to them in the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954.*

7. From the foregoing, it is clear that the entire Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954 takes the definition of 'land' from the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954. The said definition of 'land' not being available to the Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954 when the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 ceases to exist post urbanization, makes it clear that the Delhi Land Revenue Act cannot stand on its own legs for whatsoever reasons. In simple terms, post the Delhi Land Reforms Act, the Delhi Land Revenue Act clearly has no basis to continue since the definition of 'land' itself is "non-existent" once the Land Reforms Act goes.

8. After urbanization of the land/village, the area that is squarely covered by the provisions of Section 1(2) of the Delhi Land Reforms Act is as under :

1. *Short title, extent and commencement-*  
(1) *This Act may be called the Delhi Land reforms Act 1954.*
- (2) *It extends to the whole of the Union territory of Delhi, but shall not apply to*
  - (a) *[the area which are or may before the first day of November, 1956 be] included in a Municipality or a Notified Area under the provisions of the Punjab Municipal Act, 1911, or a Cantonment under the provisions of the Cantonment Act, 1924.*
  - (b) *[areas] included in any estate owned by the Central Government or any local authority, and*
  - (c) *areas held and occupied for a public purpose or a work of public utility and declared as such by the Chief Commissioner or acquired under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, or any other enactment other than this Act, relating to acquisition of land for a public purpose.*

9. 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.

10. 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 covered in Section 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. Section 31 of the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 explains 'record of rights'. In the case of GNCTD, the Punjab Land Revenue Act,

1887 has been extended to Delhi under the aegis of Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954.

11. Similarly, as per Section 2(b) the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948 - (b) “*Consolidation of Holdings*” means the amalgamation and the redistribution of all or any of the lands in an estate or sub-division of an estate so as to reduce the number of plots in the holdings: Further, ‘economic holding’ and ‘estate’ have been defined vide Section 3(7) and 3(8) of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954.
12. Therefore, it is seen that once Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 cease and consequently, the Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954 cease to apply, the definition of ‘estate’, ‘record of rights’ and ‘economic holding’ are not available for the purpose of the consolidation proceedings under the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948.
13. In the light of all the foregoing, post-urbanization, to enter into the matter where the village already stood urbanized in 2019 would involve entering into an area where the revenue courts have no jurisdiction to enter to begin with, therefore, this court is not inclined to deal with this petition further. Accordingly, revision petition bearing No. 214/2025 titled ***Bachan Singh Vs. Consolidation Officer, Khera Kalan & Anr.*** is dismissed.
14. Further, seeing the peculiar circumstances of the case, it would not be fair to deprive the parties from seeking remedy as per law. Accordingly, protection is provided to all the parties for the next sixty days to enable them to approach the appropriate forum of law for redressal of their grievances, if any. During this period, no third party interest shall be created by any party in the impugned land.
15. File be consigned to record room after completion.

(PRASHANT GOYAL)  
Financial Commissioner  
Delhi

17.12.2025

Present : Shri N.S. Dalal, Counsel for Petitioners.  
: Shri Shyam Sunder Dalal, Counsel for Respondents.

1. The Counsel for Petitioners contended that :

- a. The Petitioner herein filed a revision petition bearing No.208/2008-CA before the predecessor Financial Commissioner stating that her petition under section 55 of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 for partition before the SDM/RA was dismissed vide order dated 08.09.1987. The appeal filed against the order of SDM/RA before the Additional Collector was allowed by the appellate court vide order dated 31.12.1996 and the matter was remanded to SDM. Aggrieved by the order of the Additional Collector, the Respondents filed a revision petition No.140/1997-CA before the Financial Commissioner. The Financial Commissioner dismissed the same vide order dated 04.07.1997. The Respondents further challenged the order of the Financial Commissioner before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. Hon'ble High Court in a detailed order dated 29.01.2004 dismissed the petition of the Respondents with finding that there is no partition by metes and bound. Respondents again filed LPA in the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi against the order of the Single Judge which was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 10.01.2008.
- b. After withdrawal of LPA by the Respondent, the petitioners approached the court of the SDM/RA to press their petition, the respondents filed an application under Order VII Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure and the SDM/RA on the basis of the said application ruled that a partition had already taken place and dismissed the suit of the petitioners, vide order dated 18.08.2008. Aggrieved by this order, the petitioners had approached the predecessor Financial Commissioner who vide order dated 03.08.2023 remanded the case back to the SDM/RA to pass a

speaking order after considering all the averments of the parties.

- c. The SDM/RA then passed the present impugned order dated 26.08.2025 rejecting the petition. Now, the Petitioners (the LRs. of Dil Kaur) filed revision petition under Section 187 of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 against the impugned order dated 26.08.2025 passed by R.A. in pursuance of the remand order dated 23.08.2023 and prays to set aside the order dated 26.08.2025 passed by RA and allow the suit thereby ordering partition of the land admeasuring 617 bighas 3 biswas situated in village Raghpur, New Delhi in equal share amongst co-sharers i.e. 1/5<sup>th</sup> share each, as prayed for in the suit.
2. The Counsel for Respondents submitted that based on the partition, the revenue authorities initiated proceedings under O-4 Register and the land was mutated in the name of Swarup Singh and Dil Kaur and the khatauni was subsequently prepared. Thereafter, till the initiation of the consolidation proceedings, there was no challenge to the partition effected to by O-4 Register and the updation in the revenue records was made. All the said proceedings were in the knowledge of the Petitioners and if aggrieved, the Petitioners could have challenged that proceedings before the civil court or any forum. In revert, the Counsel for Petitioners submitted that the review is not applicable under the DLR Act and is only allowed under CPC Act, 1908. The Counsel for Respondent then cited Section 190 of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 for review power of the revenue authorities in this regard. The Counsel for Respondents placed on record the copy of Register Karwahi (Consolidation Scheme) prepared by the Consolidation Officer.
3. It is noted that both the parties have raised contentions regarding facts which cannot be undertaken in revision and since this case has a long chequered history of litigation pertaining to partition of suit land, it would be in the fitness of things that the case is remanded back to the District Magistrate (South-West) for a thorough

examination of facts and revenue records, and to pass a speaking order after hearing all the concerned parties.

4. Accordingly, the revision petition No.189/2025 titled ***Smt.Dilkaur (since deceased) through LRs Vs. Shri Ranbir Singh (since deceased) through LRs. & Anr.*** is disposed of in terms of the above.
5. File be consigned to record room after completion.

**Financial Commissioner,  
Delhi**

17.12.2025

Present : Shri Deepak Khosla, Counsel for Petitioner.  
: Shri Akshay, Proxy Counsel for R-1 and R-2.  
: None appeared for R-3, SDM.

1. Counsel for Petitioner requested for short adjournment as he has been suffering from Eye flu from the last three days and he further undertook to come prepared to lead the arguments. Request is allowed with the direction to submit the proof of deposition of costs imposed by this Court on the last date of hearing.
2. Proxy Counsel for R-1 and R-2 requested to pass over but due to the condition of the Counsel for Petitioner, he also agreed for the adjournment sought by the Petitioner.
3. None appeared for the R-3, SDM. Issue notice to appear and lead the arguments on the next date of hearing.
4. Adj. to 23.12.2025 for arguments.

**Financial Commissioner  
Delhi**