

Case No. 39 of 2026

23.03.2026

Present : Shri Tushar Sharma, Proxy Counsel for Appellant.
: None for Respondent, DGHS.

1. The Proxy Counsel sought adjournment as the main Counsel is not available. Allowed.
2. Since the DGHS has already issued cancellation order dated 16.02.2026, the matter shall be decided ex-parte, if the Appellant is not represented appropriately on the next date of hearing.
3. Adj. to 27.03.2026 for reply of the Respondent and to decide the stay application filed by Appellant.


**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 40 of 2026

23.03.2026

Present : Shri Praveen Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Appellant.
: None for Respondents.

1. Proxy Counsel for Appellant filed the present appeal against the Impugned Order dated 17.09.2024 passed by the District Magistrate (S-W) where by the Order dated 04.09.1990 passed by the Naib Tehsildar was set-aside and prayed to set aside the order dated 17.09.2024 passed by the DM and restore the Order dated 04.09.1990 passed by the Naib Tehsildar.
2. Proxy Counsel for Appellant filed proof of service, which is taken on record.
3. Proxy Counsel for Appellant contended that the dispute on an agricultural land total measuring 21 Bigha 16 Biswa out of Khasra NO. 26//16/2(4-0), 73//4 (4-16), 7min (2-8), 8min (3-0), 13min (2-19), 14min (1-0), 17min (2-5) and 18(1-8) situated in Village Isapur, Najafgarh which was mutated in favour of the three sons of the deceased owner, Shubh Ram, following his death in 1990. The Counsel emphasized that this mutation was conducted in accordance with the Delhi Land Reforms Act at the time and remained unchallenged for thirty years until the deceased's daughter filed a claim based on subsequent legal amendments.
4. Proxy Counsel for Appellant argued on the limitation aspect as the 1990 order should not be disturbed after such a significant lapse of time. Furthermore, the Appellant challenged the jurisdiction of the District Magistrate (DM) to pass the impugned order, asserting that because the area has been notified as

a LDRA vide Notification dated 18.06.2013, the revenue authorities ceased to have enjoy jurisdiction as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No.3502/2022 titled ***Rajeev Shah (Deceased) through LR Gayatri Shah Vs. Government of NCT of Delhi & Ors.*** and in WP(C) No.7159/2023 titled ***Shweta Agarwal & Anr. Vs. Govt of NCT of Delhi & Anr.*** respectively have held that the villages which are notified as L.D.R.A. villages are no longer covered under the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954. The Counsel also cited the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in WPC No. 6435/2007 titled ***Nirmala Vs. GNCT of Delhi & Ors.*** to support their position regarding the interplay between the Hindu Succession Act and the DLR Act. He contended that the DM did not have authority to decide on a dispute under Hindu Succession Act.

5. None appeared for the Respondents. Issue notice for the same.
6. None appeared for R-9, DM. Issue notice to the District Magistrate (Kapashera) for appearance through Counsel on the next date of hearing.
7. Adj. to 17.04.2026 for arguments.


**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

**Amrit Farms Private Limited
Vs.
Settlement Officer (Consolidation)/SDM (Alipur)**

23.03.2026

Present : Shri Udaybir Singh, Counsel for Appellant.
: Shri V. P. Rana, Counsel for R-3.

1. Counsel for Appellant filed Gazette Notification dated 22.02.2013 which is taken on record.
2. Counsel for the Appellant argued that under a 2013 notification (No. 3303), the power to hear appeals under Section 21(4) of the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948, has been delegated to the Additional District Magistrate (ADM) and the Financial Commissioner should not entertain such appeal.
3. Counsel for Appellant expressed an urgent need for protection, stating that authorities were attempting to take possession of the property based on an order passed without jurisdiction and requested a stay to allow time to approach the appropriate ADM.
4. Counsel for R-3 filed reply which is taken on record.
5. Counsel for R-3 objected to the grant any interim relief and argued that once the court lacks jurisdiction over the matter, it inherently lacks the legal authority to pass any interim orders or grant a stay. He maintained that providing such protection would be "completely contrary to law" and argued that the Appellant's only recourse should be to withdraw the current matter and seek a remedy from the competent authority. In rebuttal, Counsel for Appellant submitted to withdraw the Appeal with liberty to file appeal before the Competent Authority.

However, he stated that in the interest of justice, a brief stay is essential.

6. In view of the above arguments, the present appeal bearing no. 28/2026 titled ***Amrit Farms Private Limited Vs. Settlement Officer (Consolidation)/SDM (Alipur)*** is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the Appellant to approach the Competent Authority in accordance with law. In the interest of justice, to permit appellant to approach concerned authority, no coercive action shall be taken against the Petitioner within next 15 days.
7. Copy of this Order be given dasti as requested by the Counsel for Appellant.
8. File be consigned to record room after completion.


(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No.	Titled
41/2026	Arun Nagariya & Anr. Vs C.O./Tehsildar (Narela)
42/2026	Radha Gupta & Anr. Vs C.O./Tehsildar (Narela)
43/2026	Ankit Gupta Vs C.O./Tehsildar (Narela)

23.03.2026

Present : Shri N. S. Dalal, Counsel for Petitioner(s) in all three cases.
: None for Respondent, C.O. in all three cases.

1. Counsel for Petitioner(s) filed these revision petitions u/s 42 of East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948 for seeking direction/ order against the Impugned Order dated 09.01.2019 passed by the C.O. to expeditiously and in a time-bound manner.

2. Counsel for Petitioner(s) contended that:

(In Case No. 41/2026)- One Sh. Karan Singh was recorded co-owner of parcels of land prior to consolidation and total 44 Bigha & 5 biswa was allotted to him during repartition. Karan Singh transferred land in Khara No. 27//24 min, 17 min, 14 min, 15 min & 16 min to Saroj Kumar through Reg. sale deed. Saroj Kumar transferred land in Khasra No. 27//14 (2-16) & 27//17 (2-16) to Smt. Giano Devi & Smt. Krishna Devi through Regd. Sale Deed & Mutation also sanctioned in favour of both. Petitioners purchased said land from Giano Devi & Krishna Devi through Regd. Sale deeds & mutation was in favour of Petitioners. The CO vide order dated 09.01.2019 without prior information/Notice deducted land measuring 10 biswas out of Khasra No. 27//17 & 3 biswas out of Khasra No. 27//14 from Petitioner's khata. The SO/SDM vide order dated 05.09.2020 set aside the order of dated 09.01.2019

passed by the CO and remanded to CO to decide afresh.

(in Case No. 42/2026)- one Sh. Karan Singh was recorded co-owner of parcels of land prior to consolidation. Sh. Karan Singh transferred land in Khasra No. 27//24 min, 17 min, 14 min, 15 min & 16 min to Saroj Kumar through Registered Sale Deeds. Saroj Kumar transferred land in Khasra No. 27//14 (2-16) & 27//17 (2-16) to Smt. Nirmal through Regd. Sale Deed and Mutation was sanctioned in her favour. Smt. Nirmal also purchased 2/3rd share out of land in Khasra No. 26//20 (2-18) & 27//16 (2-04) & mutation also in favour of her. On 31.07.2015 & 26.08.2015, Petitioner purchased land in khasra No. 27//15 (3-00), 27//16 (2-12) & 2/3rd share in Khasra No. 26//20 (2-18) & 27//16 (2-04) from Smt. Nirmala through Reg. Gift deeds & mutation was in favour of Petitioners. The CO vide order dated 09.01.2019, without prior information/notice, deducted land measuring 1 Bigha 2 Biswa out of khasra No. 27//16 from petitioner khata. The SO/SDM (Alipur) vide order dated 05.09.2020 set aside the order of dated 09.01.2019 passed by the Co and remand the matter to CO to decide afresh.

(in Case No. 43/2026)- One Sh. Karan Singh was recorded co-owner of parcels of land prior to consolidation and total 44 Bigha & 5 biswa was allotted to him during repartition. Sh. Karan Singh transferred land in Khara No. 27//24 min, 17 min, 14 min, 15 min & 16 min to Saroj Kumar through Regd. Sale Deed. Saroj Kumar transferred land in Khasra No. 69//13 min (3-4) & 69//18 min (2-15) to Sh. Roshan Lal. On 17.02.2014 & 10.03.2014, Roshan Lal executed Regd. Sale Deed dt. 31.10.2006 in

favour of Ms. Anjali Gupta & Mutation was also sanctioned in her favour. Petitioner purchased land from Anjali through Regd. Gift deeds & mutation was in favour of petitioner. The CO vide order dated 09.01.2019, without prior information/Notice deducted land measuring 1 Bigha 5 Biswa out of khasra No. 67//13 from Petitioner khata. The SO/SDM (Alipur) set aside the order of dated 09.01.2019 of CO and remanded the matter to CO to CO to decide afresh.

3. Counsel for Petitioner(s) contended that a significant delay has occurred in the final resolution of the matter. Counsel further contended that the Consolidation Officer (CO) withdrew the petitioner's land vide an Order dated 09.01.2019 that was subsequently challenged. This order was set aside by the SO/SDM (Alipur) on 05.09.2020 on the grounds that it was passed without following proper legal procedures. The SO then remanded the matter back to the CO for a fresh decision.
4. The Counsel emphasized that despite this remand order, six years have passed since the original Order dated 09.01.2019 remains "sub-judice" before the CO without any finality. He requested the Court to direct the CO to implement the SO/SDM (Alipur) order dated 05.09.2020 in the official revenue records to reflect that the 09.01.2019 order was set aside.
5. In view of the above submissions, this Court took note of the Petitioner's grievances regarding the delay. It is also observed that since the SO/SDM (Alipur) had already set aside the order dated 09.01.2019 passed by the C.O. and CO's order effectively no longer exists in the eyes of the law.

6. This Court remanded the matter to C.O. to decide the petitions within three months in accordance with the directions provided in the remand order dated 05.09.2020 passed by the SO/SDM. The concerned DM will counsel the CO to decide on the matter long pending before him.
7. Consequently, the revision petitions bearing nos. 41/2026, 42/2026 and 43/2026 are disposed of in terms of the above.
8. Files be consigned to record room after completion.



(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No. 35 of 2026

**Ranbir Singh Rana
Vs.
Consolidation Officer**

23.03.2026

Present : Shri Adamyia Pal Singh, Counsel for Petitioner.
: None for Respondents.

1. Counsel for Petitioner filed the present revision petition u/s 42 of East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948 for calling of records, examination of legality/propriety of proceedings and pass appropriate order/ direction for immediate implementation of final and binding order dated 28.06.2012 passed by the C.O. for rectification and restoration of common passage/ rasta.
2. Counsel for Petitioner contended that despite a rectification order dated 28.06.2012 passed by the Consolidation Officer (CO), the revenue records have not been updated. Counsel further contended that consolidation proceedings in Village Khera Garhi initiated in 1999 during which a specific path (rasta) was finalized through plot numbers 9, 53, 72, 119, 139, 186, 08, 249, 273, 301, 326 and 339 and 854/71. After several representations and a directive from the Public Grievances Commission (PGC), the CO eventually ordered a rectification in 2012 to restore the original path.
3. Counsel for Petitioner submitted that although consolidation proceedings were closed on 07.07.2025, the Order dated 28.06.2012 remains unimplemented. Counsel further clarified that while a previous WPC No. 8711/2023 exists before the Hon'ble High Court, Petitioner was not a party to it

and is seeking a direct order for the CO to implement the existing rectification.

4. None appeared for the Respondent.
5. In view of the above arguments, justice would be served if the matter is remanded to the CO concerned to examine why the order dated 28.06.2012 has not been enforced and to decide on the Petitioner's pending representations. The CO shall decide on the matter in next three months. The DM concerned would also counsel the CO to decide on the matter.
6. Consequently, the revision petitioner bearing no. 35/2026 titled ***Ranbir Singh Rana Vs. Consolidation Officer*** is disposed of in terms of the above.
7. The copy of this order be served to the DM (North).
8. File be consigned to record room after completion.


(PRASHANT GOYAL)
Financial Commissioner
Delhi

Case No. 38 of 2026

23.03.2026

Present : Shri Rajiv Vig, Counsel alongwith Shri Vijay Kamra,
Secretary for Petitioner Society.
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-1, RCS.

1. Counsel for R-1, RCS requested for adjournment as she is not prepared to argue the matter today and also the copy of revision petition has not been supplied to the RCS. Counsel for Petitioner undertook to supply copy of petition to RCS.
2. Counsel for Petitioner requested to grant Stay against the operation of the impugned orders dated 28.02.2024 and 14.01.2026 passed by the Spl. RCS and RCS respectively as the same are passed in total and blatant violation of the statutory mandatory provisions of the DCS Act, 2003 and DCS Rules, 2007. Counsel submitted that all the requirements of Rule 92 read with Section 79 of the DCS Act, 2003 was not fulfilled by R-2 herein and the R-1/RCS did not even consider the provision contained in Section 79 of the DCS Act.
3. Heard the Counsel for Petitioner. The operation of the impugned orders dated 28.02.2024 and 14.01.2026 passed by the Spl. RCS and RCS respectively are stayed till the next date of hearing.
4. Adj. to 27.03.2026 for reply of the Respondents.


**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 44 of 2026

23.03.2026

Present : Shri Rajiv Vig, Counsel for Petitioners.
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-1, RCS.

1. Counsel for R-1, RCS requested for adjournment as she is not prepared to argue the matter today and also the copy of revision petition has not been supplied to the RCS.
2. Counsel for Petitioners undertook to supply copy of petition to RCS.
3. Adj. to 27.03.2026 for reply of the Respondent, RCS.


**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**

Case No. 45 of 2026

23.03.2026

Present : Shri Dinkar Kumar, Proxy Counsel for Appellants.
: Shri Piyush Goel, Associate Counsel for R-1.
: Ms. Vasu Singh, Counsel for R-2, RCS.
: Shri V. K. Rastogi, Administrator of Society/R-3 in person.

1. Counsel for R-2, RCS requested for adjournment as she is not prepared to argue the matter today and also the copy of revision petition has not been supplied to the RCS.
2. Associate Counsel for R-1 also requested for supplying the copy of petition.
3. The Appellants are represented by the Proxy Counsel and he filed proof of service and stated that copy of petition has already been supplied to the respondents. However, the Proxy Counsel supplied copy of petition to RCS and undertook to supply the same to R-2 also.
4. Adj. to 17.04.2026 for reply of the Respondents.


**Financial Commissioner
Delhi**