



\$~62 & 66

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 10833/2025

AYUSH GUPTA

.....Petitioner

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

+ W.P.(C) 10839/2025

ANANTAM FARM

.....Petitioner

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Appearance:

Mr. Akhil Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Lalitaksh Joshi and Ms. Ananya Sanjiv Saraogi, Advocates for R-1 and 2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

25.07.2025

%

1. In both these petitions, the petitioners seek implementation of orders passed by the Financial Commissioner [order dated 10.10.2024 in W.P.(C) 10833/2025 and orders dated 26.09.2024 and 18.10.2024 in W.P.(C) 10839/2025], by which proceedings instituted in respect of their properties under Section 81 of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 ["DLRA"], were declared *non-est*.

2. In the orders of the Financial Commissioner, it was noted that



proceedings under Section 81 of the DLRA were initiated against the recorded owners of the subject property in the year 2023, although the village in question [Village Bakoli] had been declared as a low-density residential area by notification dated 18.06.2013. Consequently, following the judgment of this Court in *Rajeev Shah (Deceased) Through LR Gayatri Shah v. Government of NCT of Delhi & Ors.* [W.P.(C) 3502/2022, decided on 10.04.2023] and other similar judgments, the Financial Commissioner held as follows:

“10. In the light of alt the foregoing, it is observed that the revenue courts have no jurisdiction to enter into such matters where either the land/village has been declared urbanized or declared Low Density Residential Area and the provisions of Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 cease to apply since 18.06.2013 in this case. Accordingly, the impugned conditional orders dated 19.12.2023 passed by the RA/SDM are liable to be set aside and are set aside. Needless to say that proceedings pending before the RA/SDM cannot continue and are, therefore, declared non-est in terms of the above judgments as the revenue courts ceased to have jurisdiction. The revision petition bearing No.157/2024 titled Ayush Gupta Vs. Gram Sabha Bakoli & Anr. is accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs.”¹

3. The impugned orders in W.P.(C) 10839/2025 are substantially similar.
4. The grievance of the petitioners is that despite the orders of the Financial Commissioner, the concerned Sub-Divisional Magistrate [“SDM”] has not formally closed the proceedings. Mr. Akhil Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that the land records continue to reflect that the proceedings under Section 81 of DLRA as subsisting.
5. The petitioners have made representations dated 23.12.2024 to this effect, which have failed to elicit a response.

¹ Paragraph 10 of the impugned order dated 10.10.2024 in W.P.(C) 10833/2025.



6. Mr. Lalitaksh Joshi, learned counsel for Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi, has taken instructions, and submits that the Gram Sabha, which was the contesting party before the Financial Commissioner has not been made a party.

7. Having regard to the orders already passed by the Financial Commissioner, I am of the view that the appropriate course is to direct the SDM to take an appropriate decision within a limited timeframe.

8. The writ petitions are, therefore, disposed of, with a directions upon the concerned SDM to take appropriate consequential steps in terms of the order of the Financial Commissioner within a period of four weeks positively from today, upon notice to the Gram Sabha.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JULY 25, 2025
SS/AD/