



\$~59 & 62

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

+ W.P.(C) 11454/2025

MANISH JAIN & ORS.

.....Petitioners

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

+ W.P.(C) 11512/2025

VINIT KUMAR

.....Petitioner

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Appearance:

Mr. Akhil Kumar, Advocate for petitioners.

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

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

04.08.2025

1. In both these petitions, the petitioners seek implementation of orders passed by the Financial Commissioner [order dated 18.10.2024 in W.P.(C) 11454/2025 and order dated 26.09.2024 in W.P.(C) 11512/2025], by which proceedings instituted in respect of their respective 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 all 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 all these cases. Accordingly, the impugned conditional orders dated 19.12.2023 and 29.12.2023 passed by the RA/SDM in all five cases 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.183/2024 titled Manish Jain & Ors. Vs. Gram Sabha Bakoli & Anr., 184/2024 titled Anisha Pal & Anr. Vs. Gram Sabha Bakoli & Anr., 185/2024 titled Manish Jain & Ors. Vs. Gram Sabha Bakoli & Anr., 186/2024 titled Anisha Pal & Anr. Vs. Gram Sabha Bakoli & Anr. and 159/2024 titled Anantam Farm Vs. Gram Sabha Bakoli & Anr. are accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs”¹

3. The impugned order in W.P.(C) 11512/2025 is 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 petitioner has made a representation dated 23.10.2024 in W.P.(C) 11454/2025 to this effect, which has failed to elicit a response.

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 direction upon the concerned SDM to take appropriate consequential steps in terms of the orders of the Financial Commissioner within a period of four weeks positively from today, upon notice to the Gram Sabha.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

AUGUST 4, 2025

SS/sd/

¹ Paragraph 10 of the impugned order dated 18.10.2024 in W.P.(C) 11454/2025.