

05.01.2026

Present : Shri Vineet Kumar, Counsel for Appellant.
: Ms. Ruchika Rathi, Counsel for R-1, DSIIDC.
: Shri Abhishek Kumar, Counsel for R-2 (M/s.PNC Delhi
Indl. Infra (P) Ltd.)

1. Counsel for Appellant contended that as per direction of this Court on the last date of hearing i.e. 10.11.2025, Respondent was directed to file audit report and also clarify as to why there is a difference of CETP charges in respect of Bawana and Narela Industrial Areas. Appellant further submitted that they received the written submission only on last Saturday evening and need some time to file his rejoinder.
2. Appellant further contended that in the year 2023, notification was issued regarding sewerage charges for the first time and the same are now being charged retrospectively w.e.f. the year 2012 onwards. Appellant also contended that separate sewerage charges and CETP charges are being charged in a single bill, although, both are different charges.
3. R-1 in response submitted that delay in finalization and notification of CETP and sewerage charges was solely due to persistent failure of industrial association including the appellant to furnish mandatory information required under schedules I and II of the CETP Act. As regards, allegations of double recovery of sewerages charges by the DJB, it is submitted that DJB bills contain a pre-printed column "Sewerage charges" without any actual levy of the same. Respondent submitted that Sewerage Charges and CETP Charges are issued in separate bills. She agreed to file some recent DJB bills on the next date of hearing to clarify this.
4. Appellant is directed to file rejoinder with an advance copy to the Respondent on or before 12.01.2026.

5. Appellant was advised on the last date of hearing i.e. 10.11.2025 to visit the office of DSIDC within one week for requisite information which was duly agreed to by DSIDC. However, it is noted that the Appellant did not visit the office of the DSIDC. The appellant is again given liberty to visit DSIDC to seek the requisite information.
6. Respondent is directed to file replication to the Rejoinder, if any by 16.01.2026.
7. Respondent is further directed to comply with the following directions before the next date of hearing. Respondent to file the copy of the bills of DJB showing that no sewerages charges have levied. She will also submit an affidavit that DSIDC has calculated CETP and sewerage charges exclusively for Narela Industrial Area and not done it by grouping Narela area with other industrial areas. She will also clarify the rationale for substantial difference between the CETP charges of Narela and Bawana Industrial areas.
8. Adj. to 20.01.2026 for further arguments.

(Bhupesh Kumar)
Chief Engineer
(SDW) NW
Delhi Jal Board
Member

(Seena Jose)
Deputy Controller of
Accounts
Member

(Prashant Goyal)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi
Chairperson

05.01.2026

Present : Shri Anuj Chaturvedi, Counsel alongwith Dr.Dhruv Kapoor Representative for Appellant.
: Shri Niraj Kumar, Proxy Counsel alongwith Dr.Kusum Arora, MSNH, DGHS for Respondent, DGHS.

1. The Proxy Counsel for Respondent, DGHS submitted that the main Counsel is busy for urgent matter in Hon'ble Delhi High Court. The Proxy Counsel for Respondent further submitted that the BTF was issued only on 1st January and the matter is to be discussed by DGHS with the newly appointed Counsel. The Respondent, DGHS is directed to file its reply and to be represented appropriately on the next date of hearing.
2. On query of this court regarding why the name of Hygiea hospital does not figure in the list of 300 nursing homes submitted before the Hon'ble High Court, the Counsel for Appellant submitted that although the hospital name does not figure in the said list but the judgment of the Hon'ble court is applied on his hospital too. He assured the court to file copy of the said judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.
3. The Appellant is directed to file brief written submission on each objection raised by DGHS with advance copy to the Respondent before the next date of hearing. Likewise, the Respondent is also directed to file further written submissions, if any on the written submissions of Appellant, with advance copy to the Appellant before the next date of hearing.
4. Adj. to 13.01.2026 for further arguments.

**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

05.01.2026

Present : Shri Deepak Khosla, Counsel for Petitioner.
: Shri Pradeep, Counsel for R-1 & R-2.

1. Counsel for Petitioner stated that there have been different interpretations made by the different benches of Hon'ble High Court on the applicability of provisions of Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 post urbanisation in respect of the judgement dated 14.03.2023 rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of "***Mohinder Singh (Deceased) through LRs. Vs. Narain Singh (Deceased) through LRs***". The matter is presently subjudiced before the Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and no judgement has been pronounced till date in the matter. Therefore, no final decision may be taken by the revenue authorities including this Court on the applicability of DLR Act, post urbanisation of the village.
2. Counsel for R-1 & R-2 filed judgement passed by the Hon'ble High Court in LPA 896/2024 in the matter of "***Madan Pal Gupta & Anr. Vs. Maya Devi & Anr.***," and shared the copy with opposite side.
3. On a specific query by this Court regarding difference between the judgement in the matter of "Subnam Gupta" and "***Madan Pal Gupta & Anr. Vs. Maya Devi & Anr.***," the Counsels submitted that in both the cases, the date of urbanisation notification was later than the cases were filed before the revenue authorities.
4. Thereafter, the Counsel for R-1 & R-2 raised the issue that in the present case, there is element of

fraud involved and the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the judgment dated 27.10.1993 in case titled as "**S. P. Chengalvaraya Naidu (dead) Vs. Jagannath (dead)**" has laid down the law. Counsel for Petitioner in rebuttal submitted that in case the Hon'ble High Court decides the issue of jurisdiction of revenue authorities post urbanisation, then only further agitation on grounds of fraud in a DLR matter could be done.

5. Adj. to 16.02.2026.



(Prashant Goyal)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi